

Mark 14,1-52: Narrative Structure and Reader-Response

The goal of the following investigation is twofold: First, we want to illustrate the narrative structure formed by the nine scenes comprising the beginning of the Marcan passion narrative in Mark 14,1-52. This will involve the demonstration of how these scenes are arranged in a pattern of literary sandwiches in which each successive scene is contrastingly framed by two other mutually related scenes⁽¹⁾. And secondly, we want to determine the significance of this narrative structure in terms of its rhetorical effects on the implied reader.

I. Narrative Structure of Mark 14,1-52

We begin with a schematic representation of the network of literary sandwiches formed by the nine scenes in Mark 14,1-52:

- (1) 14,1-11: Jesus anticipates his death by Jewish leaders
 - a¹ 14,1-2 Jewish leaders plot arrest and death of Jesus
- A b¹ 14,3-9 Death of Jesus is anticipated during a meal
 - a² 14,10-11 The disciple Judas plans to betray Jesus to death
- (2) 14,12-25: Jesus prepares disciples for his death
 - b² 14,12-16 Jesus directs disciples to prepare Passover meal
- B a³ 14,17-21 During meal Jesus predicts betrayal by a disciple
 - b³ 14,22-25 Jesus and disciples share in his triumph over death through the Passover meal
- (3) 14,26-52: Jesus accepts death through prayer
 - a⁴ 14,26-31 Jesus predicts abandonment/denial by disciples
- A' b⁴ 14,32-42 While still with disciples Jesus accepts death through prayer
 - a⁵ 14,43-52 Jesus is arrested, betrayed by Judas and abandoned by disciples.

As the above schema illustrates, the nine scenes comprising Mark 14,1-52 divide themselves into three sets of intercalations. In

⁽¹⁾ For a discussion of the literary device of "sandwiching", see J. R. EDWARDS, "Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narratives", *NT* 31 (1989) 193-216.

the first set the story of Jesus' anointing for burial by a woman during a meal at Bethany in 14,3-9 is framed between the mutually related scenes of the Jewish leaders plotting the arrest and death of Jesus in 14,1-2 and of Judas offering to betray Jesus to these leaders in 14,10-11. This first sandwich is grouped together by the literary inclusion formed by the temporal notices that it was "two days before the feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread" as the introduction to the first scene (14,1), and that Judas was seeking "an opportune time" (*eukairōs*) to betray Jesus as the conclusion to the final scene (14,11). The geographical focus for this first sandwich is the village of "Bethany" (14,3), the place of Jesus' anointing and the only explicit geographical reference in this sandwich. But as a dramatic expansion of his anointing in the privacy of the house at Bethany, Jesus projects a future geographical focus in the public domain when he announces that "wherever the gospel is proclaimed in the whole world, what she has done will be told in memory of her" (14,9).

In the second set (14,12-25) Jesus' prediction that one of the Twelve will betray him in 14,17-21 is sandwiched between the mutually related scenes of Jesus directing his disciples to prepare for him to eat the Passover meal with them as their Teacher in 14,12-16 and of Jesus eating the Passover with his disciples as an anticipation of his triumph over death in 14,22-25. A literary inclusion formed by temporal notices again serves to group together this second sandwich: The notice that it was "the first day (*hēmera*) of the feast of Unleavened Bread" introduces the first scene (14,12), and the notice that Jesus will never again drink of the fruit of the vine "until that day (*hēmeras*)" when he drinks it in the kingdom of God concludes the final scene (14,25)⁽²⁾. The geographical focus for this second sandwich is Jerusalem, which, as the traditional place for the celebration of Passover, is the obvious reference for the "city" to which Jesus sends two of his disciples to prepare the Passover meal (14,13.16). But Jesus again expands the horizon beyond the present focus when he promises to drink on "that day" of the fruit of the vine anew "in the kingdom of God" (14,25).

In the third set (14,26-52) Jesus' acceptance of death through prayer while still with his disciples in 14,32-42 is sandwiched

(2) In 14,17 the temporal notice, "when it was evening", introduces the second scene (14,17-22) of this sandwich.

between the mutually related scenes of Jesus predicting the disciples' total abandonment of him and Peter's denial of him in 14,26-31⁽³⁾ and of Jesus being arrested by agents from the Jewish leaders, betrayed by Judas and abandoned by his disciples in 14,43-52. The temporal focus for this intercalation is provided by the references to "this very night" in the first scene (14,30) and to the climactic "hour" in the central scene: After Jesus prays that "the hour" (*hē hōra*) might pass by him in 14,35, he announces that "the hour" (*hē hōra*) has come in 14,41. The references to the "Mount of Olives" at the beginning of the first scene (14,26) and to a place named "Gethsemane" at the beginning of the second scene (14,32) establish the geographical focus for all three scenes in this sandwich. But once again Jesus extends the horizon of both the temporal and geographical focuses beyond the present "hour" and beyond Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives, when he promises that "after I have been raised up, I will go before you to Galilee" (14,28)⁽⁴⁾.

Although the above schema portrays the primary set of intercalations in Mark 14,1-52, there are still others. Indeed, the entire pattern of nine scenes is arranged in the following interlocking network of seven sandwiches:

- (1) Mark 14,1-11: a¹ 14,1-2; b¹ 14,3-9; a² 14,10-11.
- (2) Mark 14,3-16: b¹ 14,3-9; a² 14,10-11; b² 14,12-16.
- (3) Mark 14,10-21: a² 14,10-11; b² 14,12-16; a³ 14,17-21.
- (4) Mark 14,12-25: b² 14,12-16; a³ 14,17-21; b³ 14,22-25.
- (5) Mark 14,17-31: a³ 14,17-21; b³ 14,22-25; a⁴ 14,26-31.
- (6) Mark 14,22-42: b³ 14,22-25; a⁴ 14,26-31; b⁴ 14,32-42.
- (7) Mark 14,26-52: a⁴ 14,26-31; b⁴ 14,32-42; a⁵ 14,43-52.

Now that we have illustrated the sequence of scenes within the narrative structure of Mark 14,1-52, what is its purpose? What does this alternating pattern of contrasting scenes accomplish as they are heard by the audience?

⁽³⁾ Marcan exegetes are divided on whether the transitional verse 14,26 belongs to the conclusion of the previous scene or introduces the next scene. We feel that the reference to the Mount of Olives in 14,26 is better viewed as the introduction to a new setting rather than as the conclusion to the scenes of the Passover meal, which take place in Jerusalem (14,12-25).

⁽⁴⁾ For a full discussion of the geographical references in Mark, see E. S. MALBON, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark* (San Francisco 1986).

II. The Response of the Implied Reader to Mark 14,1-52

We understand the "implied" reader to be a theoretical construct and purely textual reality distinct from any actual reader⁽⁵⁾. "Reader-response" concerns the "rhetorical effect" that the text produces for its implied reader⁽⁶⁾. By the "implied reader", then, we mean the reader or audience that the text presupposes in order to be actualized as a communicative event; it is "the reader" generated by the text when it is read. In accord with this approach we will focus upon the responses of the implied reader as determined by the various presuppositions, strategies and indicators within the Marcan narrative. More specifically, we will examine what the alternating pattern of contrasting scenes in Mark 14,1-52 *does to*, and how it *affects*, its reader or audience, that is, what this intricate narrative structure of successive intercalations causes its reader to experience in order to produce the meaning latent in the text and thus to bring its act of communication to completion⁽⁷⁾.

A. Mark 14,1-11: Conspiracy and Anointing for Burial

1. a¹ 14,1-2: Jewish leaders plot arrest and death of Jesus

The opening announcement that "it was two days before the feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread" leads the reader to place the events now to be narrated within the context of this important festival, when Jewish pilgrims journeyed to Jerusalem to commemorate not only their participation in the past saving deeds of God on behalf of Israel, especially their exodus from slavery in Egypt (Exod 12), but also their hopeful anticipation of participating

(⁵) For more explanation of this type of reader-response criticism, see B.C. LATEGAN, "Reference: Reception, Redescription and Reality", *Text and Reality. Aspects of Reference in Biblical Texts* (ed. B.C. LATEGAN – W.S. VORSTER) (Atlanta 1985) 67-75; J.L. STALEY, *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS 82; Atlanta 1988) 21-49; R.W. FUNK, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Sonoma 1988) 34-38; W.S. VORSTER, "The Reader in the Text: Narrative Material", *Reader Perspectives on the New Testament* (ed. E.V. MCKNIGHT) (Semeia 48; Atlanta 1989) 21-39.

(⁶) K.A. PLANK, *Paul and the Irony of Affliction* (Atlanta 1987) 9.

(⁷) J.P. HEIL, "Reader-Response and the Irony of Jesus before the Sanhedrin in Luke 22:66-71", *CBQ* 51 (1989) 272.

in God's future and final salvation⁽⁸⁾. That this great double feast is imminent plus the fact that the chief priests and scribes had earlier failed to undermine the authority of Jesus in the temple (11,27-33) and to "trap him in his speech" (12,13) in order to discredit his teaching before "the crowd" has now moved them to resort to "deceit" (*dolos*) in their attempt to arrest Jesus and have him put to death. They must now resort to deceit if they are to avoid a "tumult" (*thorybos*) of the "people" (*laos*) during the festival, which would further lessen their status among the Jewish "people" as their authorized leaders.

This represents a development of what has previously been reported about the attempt of the Jewish leaders to eliminate Jesus: In 11,18, after Jesus had condemned the temple cult and by implication its Jewish leadership (11,15-17), the chief priests and scribes "were seeking" (*ezētoun*) how to destroy him, for they feared him because the whole "crowd" (*ochlos*) was astounded at his teaching. And, in 12,12, after the chief priests, scribes and elders realized that Jesus had directed the parable of the wicked tenants (12,1-11) against themselves, they "were seeking" (*ezētoun*) "to arrest" (*kratēsai*) him, but they feared the "crowd" (*ochlon*) (see also 11,32). But now, in 14,1-2, these Jewish leaders "were seeking" (*ezētoun*) how "to arrest" (*kratēsantes*) Jesus "by deceit" (*en dolō*) and are concerned not just with "the crowd" attracted to Jesus in the temple but with causing a "tumult", a riot or commotion (see 5,38), among "the people", that is, the "people" composed of Jerusalem residents and Jewish pilgrims who have come to celebrate the Passover, and who thus represent "the people" (*ho laos*) of Israel as God's specially chosen "people" in the history of salvation⁽⁹⁾.

⁽⁸⁾ On the significance of this double feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread for the events regarding Jesus' passion, see F. LENTZEN-DEIS, "Passionsbericht als Handlungsmodell? Überlegungen zu Anstößen aus der 'pragmatischen' Sprachwissenschaft für die exegetischen Methoden", *Der Prozess gegen Jesus: Historische Rückfrage und theologische Deutung* (ed. K. KERTELGE) (QD 112; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1988) 208-209.

⁽⁹⁾ The only other use of the word *laos* in Mark occurs in the quotation of LXX Isa 29,13 in Mark 7,6, where "this people" (*houtos ho laos*) clearly refers to the salvation-historical people of Israel. For a discussion of the narrative progression from "the crowd" (*ho ochlos*) in 11,18.32 and 12,12 to "the people" representative of the entire people of Israel in 14,2, see E. MANICARDI, *Il cammino di Gesù nel Vangelo di Marco: Schema narrativo e tema cristologico* (AnBib 96; Rome 1981) 133-135.

From Jesus' previous predictions of his passion, death and resurrection (8,31; 9,31; 10,33-34) the reader knows that the chief priests and scribes will succeed in arresting Jesus and having him put to death, but considerable dramatic tension is now aroused with regard to exactly how this will happen, how it is related to the salvific significance of the Jewish Passover festival, and what is involved in their treacherous "deceit". The cautious desire of the Jewish authorities thus raises the suspenseful query: Will the "deceit" of the chief priests and scribes enable them to prevent God's plan for the inevitable arrest and death of Jesus from being related to the Jewish "people" while they are celebrating the past saving deeds of God and looking forward to his final salvation?

2. *b¹ 14,3-9: Death of Jesus is anticipated during a meal*

While the chief priests and scribes are plotting how to arrest and kill him by deceit (14,1-2), Jesus is "in Bethany reclining at table in the house of Simon the leper" (14,3a). That Jesus is "in Bethany" begins to indicate the strong contrast the reader experiences with the previous scene, as it continues to express Jesus' radical separation from the condemned Jerusalem temple and the Jewish leaders responsible for it (11,15-19; 13,2). Rather than stay in Jerusalem during his controversial teaching Jesus spent his nights with his own followers in Bethany (11,1.11.19). His opposition to the chief priests and scribes is further underlined as he "is reclining at table", participating in table fellowship with his own followers "in the house of Simon the leper". In Galilee the Jewish leaders objected to Jesus' eating and thus establishing a communal bond with such social outcasts as public sinners and toll collectors (2,15-17). That Jesus is now in the house of "Simon the leper" means he is again associating with social outcasts and those who "need a physician" (see 2,17), to the displeasure of the chief priests and scribes, since the Jewish leadership banned anyone with leprosy from worship in the temple and full participation in the community (see 1,40-44). In contrast to the Jewish leaders seeking to deceitfully arrest and kill Jesus (14,1-2), his own followers, who include social and religious outcasts, are enjoying table fellowship with him in the communal and secure setting of the "house" of an outcast, Simon the leper.

The strong contrast continues as Jesus gives the proper interpretation of the woman's hospitable anointing of him with

expensive ointment, which has infuriated some of the participants of the meal (14,3b-6). Rather than an extravagant “waste” of money and a missed opportunity for exercising almsgiving as an important duty of Jewish piety, the woman’s gesture was designated by Jesus as a “good work” (*kalon ergon*), that is, an act of charitable love also highly valued by Jewish piety, which she performed not “for the poor” but “for me”, Jesus himself (14,6)⁽¹⁰⁾. Her “good work” of devoted love toward Jesus thus stands in pointed contrast to the Jewish leaders’ “deceit” (*dolos*) toward him in their attempt to arrest and kill him (14,1). Further explaining the woman’s generous gesture toward him, Jesus emphasizes the uniqueness of his situation of need by pointing to his imminent absence through death, which the woman’s anointing of him for burial anticipates (14,7-8). The reader is thus further assured of Jesus’ awareness of the deceitful death plot against him by the chief priests and scribes.

With the solemn introductory words, “amen I say to you”, Jesus further extols the woman’s loving acknowledgment of his approaching death by announcing that in the future, world-wide proclamation of the gospel her act of love in anointing him will be told as part of the gospel message in “memory” of her (14,9). This authoritative pronouncement of Jesus brings the contrast with the previous scene (14,1-2) to an ironic climax. Whereas the chief priests and scribes are deceitfully trying to avoid involving “the people” of Israel in the death of Jesus while they are celebrating the Passover feast (14,2), Jesus announces that his death will have an impact not only for “the people” of Israel but for all peoples of the “whole world”. The “memorial” (*mnēmosynon*) of what this woman has done in reverently anticipating the precious value of Jesus’ death will thus continue and far surpass the “memorial” of the Jewish Passover festival, which commemorates the saving event of the exodus as well as all of God’s other saving deeds, past, present and future⁽¹¹⁾. The global proclamation of the gospel will memorialize

⁽¹⁰⁾ As a practice of Jewish piety the value of this “good work” (*kalon ergon*) surpasses that of almsgiving in three ways: It is performed for a specific person (Jesus) rather than a general group (the poor); it requires and demonstrates a personal commitment of love rather than just an impersonal giving; and it is occasioned by a particular situation and time of urgent need rather than by the general and continual condition of the poor. See LENTZEN-DEIS, “Passionsbericht”, 216-217.

⁽¹¹⁾ LXX Exod 12,14 states in regard to the Passover (see Exod 12,1-13): “This day shall be a memorial (*mnēmosynon*) for you, and you

forever and everywhere this woman's anticipation of the death of Jesus as the definitive saving deed of God for all peoples.

In sharp contrast with the previous scene (14,1-2), then, Jesus' anointing for burial as the woman's "good work" (14,3-9) assures the reader that, although the chief priests and scribes are trying by "deceit" to arrest Jesus and have him quietly put to death in separation from "the people" and their Passover festival, the precious and enduring value of Jesus' death as *the* saving event for all peoples, now anticipated in the celebration of table fellowship with his followers, will be proclaimed forever and everywhere "throughout the whole world" (14,9).

3. α^2 14,10-11: Judas plans to betray Jesus to death

As the final scene of the first sandwich, Judas' offer to betray Jesus (14,10-11) not only contrasts the middle scene of the sandwich (14,3-9), but also develops the thematic of the opening scene (14,1-2). First of all, in ironic contrast to the anonymous woman who has just compassionately anointed Jesus (14,3-9), a named, male disciple, Judas Iscariot, who is one of Jesus' specially chosen "Twelve" with the privilege of "being with him" (3,14), now leaves the table fellowship with Jesus at Bethany (see 11,11) with the intention of betraying him (14,10). Judas, unlike the hospitable woman who anticipates Jesus' death, refuses to remain in fellowship with Jesus on his way to death. Whereas Judas, along with the other disciples called to form the Twelve, had earlier answered Jesus' summons as they "came to" (*apēlthon pros*, 3,13) him in order "to be with him" (3,14) in a close bond⁽¹²⁾, he now breaks that bond with Jesus as "he went to (*apēlthen pros*) the chief priests", the enemies seeking how to deceitfully arrest and kill Jesus (14,1), with the purpose of betraying him to them.

Furthermore, that the chief priests promise to give Judas money for his betrayal of Jesus (14,11) underlines how both the chief priests and Judas stand in ironic contrast to the nameless woman who generously anointed Jesus (14,3-9). Whereas the woman expended her costly ointment worth more than three hundred days' wages

shall celebrate it as a feast to the Lord for all your generations; as a perpetual institution you shall celebrate it".

(¹²) K. STOCK, *Boten aus dem Mit-Ihm-Sein: Das Verhältnis zwischen Jesus und den Zwölf nach Markus* (AnBib 70; Rome 1975) 7-70.

(14,5) to demonstrate her appreciation of the precious value of Jesus' death, the chief priests will spend their money not for devotion to Jesus but for deceitful betrayal leading to his death. And whereas the woman donated "all that she could" (14,8) as a "good work" (14,6), an act of love toward the dying Jesus, Judas, a specially chosen disciple (3,19), will take money in return for a treacherous act of betraying Jesus to death.

But Judas' offer to betray Jesus also advances the "deceit" against Jesus introduced in the first scene (14,1-2). When the chief priests hear Judas' offer, they are pleased because they have now found a way to arrest and kill Jesus "by deceit" to avoid a disturbance of "the people" during the Passover feast. The "deceit" will take the form of secret betrayal by Judas, "one of the Twelve", a member of the group closest to Jesus.

From the time that Jesus chose the Twelve the reader has known that Judas would be the one "who betrayed him" (3,19). That Judas is now offering to "betray" (*paradoi*) him to the "chief priests" means that the necessity that Jesus be "delivered" or "betrayed" (*paradidotai*, 9,31; *paradothēsetai*, 10,33) in accord with God's salvific plan, as repeatedly predicted by Jesus (8,31; 9,31; 10,33-34), is now being fulfilled. The reader can be assured that, although a tragic betrayal by one of the Twelve, Judas' wicked intentions against Jesus are embraced within God's salvific plan. Paradoxically, Judas, who refuses to remain in fellowship with Jesus as he approaches death, will play a prominent role in bringing about that death by betraying Jesus in accord with God's plan.

And so Judas becomes the bribed agent of the Jewish leaders in their plot to arrest Jesus and have him put to death. As the chief priests and scribes were "seeking how" (*ezētoun pōs*, 14,1) to arrest and kill Jesus by deceit, so now Judas enters into their treacherous plot and is "seeking how" (*ezētei pōs*, 14,11) to opportunely "betray" him. The suspense for the reader regarding whether Jesus will be arrested and put to death during the feast of Passover and whether it will affect "the people" (14,1-2) now focuses upon Judas' plan to advance the "deceit" of the chief priests and scribes by betraying Jesus to them.

B. Mark 14,12-25: Passover Meal and Prediction of Betrayal

1. *b² 14,12-16: Jesus directs disciples to prepare Passover meal*

Forming an intercalation with the two previous scenes, the disciples' preparation for the Passover meal (14,12-16) not only contrasts Judas' offer to betray Jesus to death (14,10-11), but also develops the thematic of close union with Jesus introduced by his anointing for death during a meal (14,3-9). The reader experiences a suspenseful contrast with the previous scene and its developing thematic with the notice that it is already "the first day of the feast of Unleavened Bread" (14,12). That the Passover has already begun stands in suspenseful opposition not only to the attempt by the chief priests and scribes to arrest Jesus and have him put to death apart from the Passover feast (14,1-2), but also to Judas' attempt to betray Jesus to them "at an opportune time" (14,11), that is, when taken in conjunction with the attempt of the chief priests and scribes, at a time separate from the Passover feast and "the people" celebrating it.

In contrast to Judas, the disciple who left table fellowship with Jesus (14,3-9) and "went away" (*apēlthen*, 14,10) to the chief priests for the purpose (*hina*) of betraying him to them, the disciples who remained in table fellowship with Jesus ask him where he wants them to "go away" (*apelthontes*, 14,12) and prepare for the purpose (*hina*) of his eating the Passover meal. Whereas Judas has broken his communal bond with Jesus, the reader is assured that there are still disciples with him who are concerned with continuing their bond of table fellowship by preparing for Jesus to eat the solemn Passover meal with them.

But the disciples' preparation for their Passover meal with Jesus also advances the theme of intimate fellowship with Jesus begun by his anointing for death during meal fellowship in Bethany (14,3-9). That Jesus sends two disciples into Jerusalem to prepare the Passover meal with authoritative instructions demonstrating his superior prophetic knowledge of the future indicates his strong desire and intention to eat the Passover with his disciples in view of his impending death (14,8), despite the concern of the Jewish leaders to prevent that death from taking place during the Passover (14,2)⁽¹³⁾. That Jesus has already been anointed for his burial (14,8)

(¹³) Jesus' instructions to two disciples here recall his similar instructions to two disciples sent to procure the colt for his entrance into Jerusalem and the temple in 11,1-11.

lends added significance to this particular Passover meal, as it places the impending death of Jesus in the salvific context of the Passover feast, which celebrates the past, present and future saving deeds of God. The reader thus realizes that Jesus has a prophetic foreknowledge of God's plan for his death superior to the enemies plotting it.

Jesus' prediction that a nameless "man carrying a jar of water" (14,13) will meet the disciples complements the nameless "woman" with her "alabaster flask of perfumed ointment" (14,3) from the previous scene of table fellowship (14,3-9). As the "woman" with her flask of ointment performs a prophetic gesture anticipating the burial of Jesus, so the "man" with his jar of ordinary water will serve as a distinctive sign leading the disciples to the room where Jesus will share the table fellowship of the Passover meal with them in view of his death⁽¹⁴⁾.

As part of his instructions to the disciples Jesus empowers them to use his authority as "*the Teacher*" (*ho didaskalos*, 14,14). They are to tell the master of the household in Jerusalem: "The Teacher says, 'Where is my guest room where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?'" (14,14). Whereas many have addressed Jesus as "teacher" throughout the narrative⁽¹⁵⁾, this is the first time Jesus refers to himself as "teacher", indeed, as "*the Teacher*", the one who "teaches" a "new teaching" with divine "authority" and "not as the scribes" (see 1,21-28). By identifying himself as "*the Teacher*", Jesus not only brings to a climax the previous references to him as "teacher" but confirms the divine authority of all of his previous teachings⁽¹⁶⁾. Not only is this the first and climactic time that Jesus refers to himself as "*the Teacher*", but it is the first and only time that he refers to his disciples as "*my disciples*" (*tōn mathētōn mou*, 14,14). This underlines the close teacher/disciple bond uniting Jesus with his followers, a bond Jesus strongly desires to deepen with "*my disciples*" through the table fellowship of this special Passover meal, which will anticipate his death (14,8.13-14)⁽¹⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁴⁾ R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium: Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27 – 16,20* (HTKNT 2/2; Freiburg–Basel–Wien 1977) 343.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Mark 4,38; 5,35; 9,17.38; 10,17.20.35; 12,14.19.32; 13,1.

⁽¹⁶⁾ This is the last reference to Jesus as "teacher" in Mark. For the previous references to his "teaching", see Mark 1,21-22.27; 2,13; 4,1-2; 6,2.6.34; 8,31; 9,31; 10,1; 11,17-18; 12,14.35.38.

⁽¹⁷⁾ On Jesus as "teacher" in the gospel of Mark, see V. K. ROBBINS, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia 1984).

It is through the prophetic predictions of Jesus and his authority as “*the Teacher*”, then, that the disciples are able to “prepare” (see 14,12.15.16) for this special Passover meal with its intimate table fellowship before the death of Jesus, already anointed for burial (14,8). That everything happens exactly as Jesus has foretold (14,15-16) underscores his superior knowledge of the future events of God’s plan and further assures the reader of the truth of all that Jesus, “*the Teacher*”, has taught and predicted, especially the predictions he taught about his passion, death and resurrection (8,31; 9,31; 10,33-34).

2. *α³ 14,17-21: During Passover meal Jesus predicts betrayal*

Forming a sandwich with the two previous scenes, Jesus’ prediction of his betrayal by a disciple (14,17-21) not only stands in tragic contrast to the preparation for the celebration of the teacher/disciple bond between Jesus and his Twelve disciples within the table fellowship of the Passover meal (14,12-16), but also advances the thematic of the scene about Judas’ offer to betray Jesus to those seeking his arrest and death (14,10-11). The tragic contrast to the theme of close union with Jesus develops as Jesus predicts that “one of you will betray me” (14,18). He then reinforces the incongruity of this serious offense with the intimacy of table fellowship as he adds, “one who is eating with me” (14,18; see Ps 41,9). That one who is “eating” the Passover meal “with Jesus” will betray him represents a grievous violation not only of the bond of table fellowship within the sacred Passover meal but of the special privilege of the Twelve “to be with” Jesus (see 3,14).

After the disciples’ reaction of “sadness” (14,19) Jesus emphasizes that the betrayer is “one of you” with the scandalous statement that he is “one of the Twelve”. And he accentuates his betrayer’s grave violation, as one who is “eating *with me (met’ emou)*” (14,18), of the intimacy of table fellowship and of the privilege of being one of the Twelve “*with him (met’ autou)*” (3,14) by adding that he is “the one who dips *with me (met’ emou)* into the dish” (14,20). The betrayer is so closely associated *with Jesus* that he even “dips” bread *with him* “into the dish”. And so the reader feels the tragedy of Jesus’ prediction, during the very sharing of table fellowship in the sacred Passover meal prepared by disciples (14,12-16), of a chosen disciple violating the privilege of intimate union with him, “the Teacher”.

Furthermore, the negative example in this third “a” scene of the one member of the Twelve who should “never have been born” for betraying Jesus to death (14,21) stands in contrast to the positive model in the first “b” scene of the woman who will be forever and everywhere memorialized in the proclamation of the gospel for anointing the body of Jesus for death (14,9).

But Jesus’ prediction of betrayal also develops the scene of Judas’ offer to betray him (14,10-11) by assuring the reader of Jesus’ superior knowledge that the conspiracy against him is embraced by the necessity of God’s salvific plan. With complete foreknowledge and acceptance of his role in God’s future plan of salvation, Jesus proclaims that as the “Son of Man” he indeed will be “delivered/betrayed” to suffer, die and rise, “as it is written of him” in accord with God’s plan recorded in the scriptures (14,21; see also 9,12.31; 10,33; 14,10).

3. *b³ 14,22-25: Jesus and disciples share in his triumph over death through the Passover meal*

Concluding an intercalation with the two previous scenes, the sharing by Jesus and his Twelve disciples in his triumph over death through their special Passover meal (14,22-25) not only contrasts Jesus’ prediction during the meal of his betrayal by one of the Twelve (14,17-21), but also develops the theme of the close teacher/disciple relationship between Jesus and the Twelve introduced in the scene of preparation for the Passover meal (14,12-16). The contrast between the scenes in 14,17-21 and 14,22-25, each of which occurs while Jesus is sharing the table fellowship of the Passover meal with the Twelve — “as they reclined and were eating” in 14,18 and “while they were eating” in 14,22, becomes evident in the reader’s sequential experience of Jesus’ solemn “amen” pronouncements in 14,18 and 14,25: That one of the Twelve who is “eating with” Jesus will betray him (14,18) and thus break his close union of “being with” (3,14) him means that Jesus will no longer drink wine, the festive drink produced from the “fruit of the vine” (14,25). This indicates not only that his death is very imminent but that it will prevent him from partaking of the joyous meal fellowship he has continually shared with his followers. But the death of Jesus through betrayal by one of the Twelve will not bring a definitive conclusion to the festivity of his table fellowship with his followers. On the contrary, the reader is assured through Jesus’ “amen” pronounce-

ment in 14,25 that “on that day” (*tēs hēmeras ekeinēs*) of God’s end-time fulfillment of his salvific activity (see 13,24-27.32 [*tēs hēmeras ekeinēs*]), after Jesus’ triumph over death through his resurrection, he will drink “new” festive wine and thus again be united in joyous meal fellowship with his followers in the “kingdom of God”.

And so through Jesus’ contrasting “amen” predictions (14, 18.25) the reader realizes that the death of Jesus will not only take place within the salvific context of the Passover festival despite his betrayer’s assistance (14,10-11) to the Jewish leaders’ attempt to prevent this (14,1-12), but that it will have a future and definitive salvific effect beyond this particular Passover feast. And furthermore, the symbolic significance that Jesus places upon his last Passover meal with the Twelve as an anticipatory sharing in his salvific death (14,22-25) assures the reader that the death of Jesus will have a salvific effect not only for “the people” of Israel but for all peoples, despite and in ironic contrast to the betrayer’s conspiracy with the Jewish authorities (14,1-2.10-11.17-21) to prevent the death of Jesus from causing a “tumult of the people” (14,2). Jesus’ designation of the wine of this unique Passover meal as “my blood of the covenant” (14,24), that is, of the “covenantal” relationship by which God united himself to Israel as his chosen people, the pledge of mutual fidelity according to which God would be their God and they would be his people, indicates the salvific effect of Jesus’ death for “the people” of Israel. And that the sacrificial “blood” of Jesus’ death “will be poured out for many” (14,24) points to the salvific effect of Jesus’ death not only for “the people” of Israel but for “all” peoples, since the term “many” (*polloi*), a common Semitic expression for “all” people, has a universalistic connotation⁽¹⁸⁾.

But the sharing by Jesus and his Twelve disciples in his triumph over death through their special Passover meal (14,22-25) also develops the theme of the close teacher/disciple relation between Jesus and the Twelve introduced by the preparation for the Passover meal (14,12-16). In his last Passover meal with his Twelve disciples, Jesus, as their Teacher and host (14,12-16), transforms the meaning of this meal for them as he places a new symbolic interpretation upon the bread and wine. After directing them to “take” the bread

(18) J. JEREMIAS, “*polloi*”, *TDNT* 6.536-545.

which he has blessed and broken for them, Jesus designates it as the symbolic equivalent of his "body": "this *is* my body". The "bread" thus becomes the very "body" or person of Jesus (*to sōma mou*, 14,22), which "body" (*to sōma mou*, 14,8) has already been anointed for death and burial. By giving them the Passover "bread", which is his "body" destined for death, to eat, Jesus enables his disciples to sacramentally share in his death as *the* salvific event which climaxes all the past saving acts of God for his people commemorated in the Passover meal which arouses hope for God's future and definitive salvation. The Twelve's special privilege "to be with" Jesus (3,14) thus reaches its high point in this unique Passover meal as they eat the bread/body of Jesus, which unites them in table fellowship "with him" on his way to death.

The ritual gestures of "taking-blessing-breaking-giving" that Jesus performs in offering the "bread" which is his "body" to his disciples (14,22) recalls the exactly corresponding gestures he used in both of the previous miraculous meals with the crowds (see 6,41; 8,6). In the miraculous meals the pattern Jesus established by his gestures of taking-blessing-breaking-giving the bread concluded with his disciples distributing the bread to the crowds, thus making them intermediary distributors to the people of the bread they received from Jesus. This pattern within the miraculous meals implies that when the disciples "take" the Passover bread/body which Jesus "gives" them, they are not only to feed themselves but to once again distribute it to the people in future celebrations of this new Passover meal. The very nature of the Passover meal as a repeatedly celebrated commemorative feast indicates that the disciples are to repeatedly celebrate this new Passover meal of Jesus. In giving them the Passover bread which is his very person destined for death, Jesus has not only left his disciples a new way "to be with him" (3,14) after he has died, but he has enabled them to feed, satisfy and unify other people "with him" and his saving death.

That "all drank (*epion*) from the cup (*potērion*)" (14,23) Jesus gave them fulfills for "all" of the disciples on the literal level the previous promise Jesus made to James and John that they would "drink (*piesthe*) the cup (*potērion*)" (10,39) that he "drinks", as a metaphor for sharing in his suffering and death before they enter into "glory" with him (10,35-40). The literal "drinking" from "the cup" that Jesus gives all the disciples, then, indicates to the reader that this new Passover meal enables those who celebrate it to

sacramentally participate in the suffering and death of Jesus and thus prepares them for their own future sufferings and deaths (see 13,9-13).

C. Mark 14,26-52: Abandonment and the Power of Prayer

1. α^t 14,26-31: Jesus predicts abandonment/denial by disciples

Forming a sandwich with the two previous scenes, Jesus' prediction of his disciples' abandonment of him (14,26-31) not only contrasts with but also develops the thematic of the previous scene of Jesus uniting his disciples with his death through the Passover meal (14,22-25), and it not only develops but also contrasts Jesus' prediction of betrayal by a disciple (14,17-21). First of all, in stunning contradiction to the meal fellowship of the special Passover they have just shared with him (14,22-25), Jesus foretells his disciples that "all of you will fall away" (14,27). "All" of the disciples who have just been closely united to Jesus on his way to death as they "all" drank from the Passover cup of wine designated as the very blood of Jesus (14,23) will "fall away" and be separated from Jesus.

Furthermore, although the disciples have just anticipated the suffering and death of Jesus, Peter, in what functions as dramatic irony for the reader⁽¹⁹⁾, protests Jesus' prediction of his denial (14,30): "Even if I must die with you, I will not deny you" (14,31). Peter ironically does not seem to realize what the reader knows, namely that a disciple "must" indeed "die with" Jesus. Unable to fulfill Jesus' demand that a disciple must "deny" (*aparnēsasthō*) oneself, "take up one's cross" and follow Jesus on the "way" to suffering and death (8,34), Peter will fail miserably as a disciple by "denying" (*aparnēse*, 14,30) Jesus rather than himself. Not only will Peter not prove to be an exception to the desertion by all the disciples (14,29), but he will sharpen his separation from Jesus by blatantly "denying" him (14,30). Ironically, it is precisely because Peter has not grasped the necessity of suffering and "dying with" Jesus (8,32-33; 9,5-8; 10,28-31) that he will "deny" him. For the reader the irony expresses the paradox that the necessity for a disciple to die with Jesus does not preclude denial of him — both

⁽¹⁹⁾ For a discussion of "dramatic irony", see HEIL, "Irony in Luke 22:66-71", 273-274.

dying with Jesus and denying him, as illustrated in Peter, are embraced by God's plan as predicted by Jesus.

And although Peter insistently maintains that he will be the one exception to desertion of Jesus by all the disciples (14,29), "they all spoke similarly" (14,31), likewise protesting their abandonment of Jesus. And so "all" (*pantes*) of the disciples, despite having anticipated the suffering and death of Jesus by eating his bread/body and drinking his cup of wine/blood (14,22-23), fail to understand that they cannot avoid abandoning Jesus because "all" (*pantes*) of them "will be scattered" in accord with the "written" plan of God. The close union that Jesus as "shepherd" has just established in his last Passover meal with his disciples will be broken as they "will be scattered" like "sheep" who disperse when their "shepherd" is killed (14,27).

But Jesus' prediction of abandonment and denial (14,26-31) also further develops for the reader the theme of Jesus' close union with his disciples through their Passover table fellowship (14,22-25). The "scattering" of the disciples will only be temporary. After Jesus, the "shepherd", has been raised from the dead, he will "go before" his disciples, the "sheep", and return "to Galilee". As Jesus had earlier "gone ahead" (*proagōn*) of his followers, leading them on the "way" to Jerusalem where he will suffer and die (10,32), so he will "go before" (*proaxō*) his disciples to Galilee (14,28) with the implication that they are to follow him. In Galilee, then, the risen Jesus will renew the bond broken by the deserting disciples. And so, the reader realizes that Jesus will not only ultimately re-establish the intimacy of table fellowship with his disciples when he drinks of the new fruit of the vine in the kingdom of God (14,25), but, before that, after his resurrection from the dead, he will rejoin his disciples in Galilee (14,28), where they may follow anew his "way" of salvation.

As expected in the sandwich pattern, Jesus' prediction of abandonment by all his disciples and denial by Peter (14,26-31) advances the theme of Jesus' prediction of betrayal by Judas, one of the Twelve (14,17-21). Not only will "one" of the Twelve eating the Passover meal with Jesus violate his bond with Jesus by betraying him to death (14,18-20) in accord with God's "written" (*gegraptai*) plan (14,21), but "all" of the disciples who have just participated in that meal fellowship will also impede their union with Jesus by "falling away" from him in accord with God's "written"

(*gegraptai*) plan (14,27). Furthermore, the leader and spokesman of the Twelve, Simon Peter (see 1,16.29-30.36; 3,16; 5,37; 8,29-33; 9,2,5; 10,28; 11,21; 13,3), will three times "deny" Jesus "this very night" (14,30).

But in addition to this development of the theme of separation from Jesus by his disciples, the reader also experiences a strong contrast and difference with regard to this theme in the scenes of Jesus' prediction of Judas' betrayal (14,17-21) and of the disciples' abandonment and Peter's denial (14,26-31). In contrast to each of the Twelve's question, "surely it is not I?" (14,19), after being distressed by Jesus' prediction that one of them would betray him (14,18), Peter, and later "all" of the rest (14,31), protest his prediction of their abandonment and denial (14,29.31), even though it must happen in accord with scripture (14,27). And whereas Jesus declares that it would have been better for Judas if he had never been born in view of his betrayal and separation from Jesus (14,21), the reader is assured that Jesus will re-establish his close union, now to be temporarily interrupted in accord with God's plan (14,27), with Peter and the rest of the disciples in accord with his promise to "go before" them to Galilee after he has been raised from the dead (14,28).

2. *14,32-42: While still with his disciples Jesus accepts death through prayer*⁽²⁰⁾

Related to the two previous scenes in an intercalation, Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane with his disciples (14,32-42) not only contrasts but also develops the theme of separation from Jesus in the previous scene of Jesus' prediction of his disciples' abandonment and denial (14,26-31), and it not only develops but also contrasts the theme of union with Jesus in the scene of Jesus' Passover table fellowship with his disciples (14,22-25). Whereas in the previous scene (14,26-31) Jesus predicts abandonment and denial by his disciples despite their contrary pledges of loyalty, in the Gethsemane scene (14,32-42) Jesus, through his powerful prayer, enables his disciples to "get up" and "go" with him (14,42) now that the

⁽²⁰⁾ For a recent exegetical discussion of the Marcan Gethsemane scene, see R. FELDMEIER, *Die Krisis des Gottessohnes: Die Gethsemaneerzählung als Schlüssel der Markuspassion* (WUNT 2/21; Tübingen 1987).

“hour” (14,41) and his betrayer have arrived despite their inability to “watch and pray” (14,38) with him during his crisis with approaching death. The contrast between these two scenes is especially evident in Jesus’ two reproachful questions to Peter: “Simon, are you asleep?” and “Could you not watch for one hour?” (14,37). These poignant questions, along with the disciples’ inability to “know what to answer him” (14,40), stand in ironical contrast to the previous promises of Peter and the disciples not to desert Jesus (14,29,31). That Peter cannot watch for even “one hour” while Jesus prays for deliverance from death contradicts his boast that even if he must die with Jesus, he will not deny him (14,31).

But the Gethsemane scene also advances the theme of the disciples’ separation from Jesus. Jesus’ prediction of abandonment and denial (14,26-31) prepared the reader for the disciples’ temporary separation from him in accord with God’s scriptural plan until after his resurrection and reunion with them in Galilee (14,27-28). But now the Gethsemane scene (14,32-42), in which Jesus commands the three disciples (Peter, James and John) to “watch” while he “prays” (14,32-34), foreshadows and serves as a paradigm for the reader’s situation of separation from Jesus after his resurrection and before his final, triumphant coming. Jesus’ command for these three disciples to “watch” (*grēgoreite*, 14,34) recalls his earlier command for the disciples and for “all” (13,37) others to “watch” (*grēgoreite*, 13,35,37) in the period after his resurrection and before his coming in glory (13,32-37). To “watch” means to be alert and ready for the critical “hour” (13,32) leading to God’s final and definitive salvation. But when Jesus returns to the three disciples after his prayer, he “finds them sleeping” rather than “watching” as he had commanded (14,34). That he “finds (*heuriskei*) them sleeping (*katheudontas*)” in 14,37 is precisely what he warned them against in his discourse preparing them for the time before his final coming in 13,35-37: “Watch, therefore; for you do not know when the lord of the house will come... lest he come suddenly and find (*heurē*) you sleeping (*katheudontas*). What I say to you, I say to all: ‘Watch!’” The disciples’ “sleeping”, then, not only indicates their inability to stay awake and “watch” during this critical time while Jesus prays before his suffering and death, but also points to their *and the reader’s* potential failure to be prepared for Jesus’ final coming by “sleeping” rather than “watching”.

The Gethsemane scene also advances the disciples' anticipation of the salvific effects of the death of Jesus through their union with him in their Passover meal (14,22-25). The Twelve disciples' unique privilege of being "with him" (*met' autou*, 3,14), which reached a climax in their Passover meal with Jesus, is now intensified as Jesus took "with him" (*met' autou*, 14,33) the special group of three within the Twelve (see 3,16-17). That Peter, James and John again accompany Jesus as he goes to pray prepares the reader for another special revelation by Jesus of his more profound character⁽²¹⁾. Although Jesus separates himself from Peter, James and John a short distance as he "goes forward a little" and prays (14,35), his praying has significance for the disciples, who, though separated, are still in close vicinity to Jesus. His exhortation to the disciples after he has prayed while they were sleeping, "get up, let us go!", indicates the powerful effect his prayer has for them. Before he withdrew to pray, Jesus commanded his disciples to "sit here" (14,32) and "remain here" (14,34) while he prayed. But after he has prayed (14,35), Jesus empowers his disciples to "get up" from their sleeping position and enables them to "go" *with him* — "let us go!" (14,42). Now that Jesus has been strengthened through his prayer, he and his disciples can "go" *together* to play their respective roles in God's plan — the disciples to be "scattered" (14,27) and Jesus to be betrayed (14,42).

Jesus' special commemorative Passover meal (14,22-25), then, gave his disciples, and by implication the reader, the opportunity of sharing in the salvific effects of Jesus' death (14,24), as they look forward to sharing in his triumphant meal in the kingdom of God (14,25). And now Jesus' Gethsemane prayer (14,32-42) furthers this theme of union with Jesus as it enables his disciples and thus the reader to overcome, in and through their union with the powerful praying of Jesus, their inability to stay awake and "watch" for the "hour" of his triumphant coming (13,32-37). Within the network of intercalations in Mark 14,1-52, then, the Gethsemane scene

(21) This is indicated by the previous narrative: Only these three disciples were chosen to accompany Jesus to witness the revelation of his power to raise the daughter of Jairus from the dead (5,37-43). Jesus took only these three with him to witness the revelation of his heavenly glory in his transfiguration (9,2-8). And it was to these three along with Andrew that Jesus revealed the events to take place after his resurrection and before his coming at the end of the world (13,3-37).

brings to a climax the thematic of solidarity with Jesus on his way to death as developed by the sequence of alternating “b” scenes (14,3-9.12-16.22-25.32-42).

But the Gethsemane scene also presents the reader with a startling contradiction to the Passover meal. Not only had Jesus assured James and John that they would “drink the cup (*potērion*)” that he “drinks” and thus share in his suffering and death (10,38-39), but he also gave the Passover “cup” (*potērion*) of his wine/blood to all the disciples to drink as a sacramental participation in his suffering and death (14,23-24). But now Jesus entreats his Father to “take this cup (*potērion*)” (of suffering and death) “away from me” (14,36). In accord with his prayer of lament, that Jesus wants God to remove “this cup” brings to a climax the expression of his deep dread and distress at the prospect of death (14,34-36).

A consideration of the introduction to Jesus’ prayer in 14,36 indicates how critically serious, profound and real his urgent request is. Acknowledging the absolute power of God, Jesus first proclaims that “all things are possible for you!” He thus demonstrates his faith in the unlimited power of God to save, a faith which he earlier exhorted others to exhibit. With the words, “all things are possible (*panta dynata*) for one who believes!” (9,23), Jesus called the father of the boy with the mute spirit, which the disciples could not expel, to acknowledge his faith in the power of God at work in Jesus to cure his son (9,14-29). With the words, “all things are possible (*panta dynata*) for God!” (10,27), Jesus invited his disciples to place their faith in the power of God to bring people, even the rich, to salvation (10,17-31). In addition, Jesus urged his disciples to “have faith in God!” (11,22), assuring them that “all that you ask for in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it shall be done for you” (11,24). And so, when Jesus proclaims in prayer that “all things are possible (*panta dynata*) for you!”, he expresses his knowledge and firm belief that God’s deliverance of him from death is a distinct and very real possibility⁽²²⁾.

But the tension of the contradiction between the divine necessity that Jesus suffer and die and his quite human trepidation to undergo that suffering and death is resolved for the reader

⁽²²⁾ S. E. DOWD, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22-25 in the Context of Markan Theology* (SBLDS 105; Atlanta 1988) 157-158.

through the very praying of Jesus as he utters the words, "but not what I will but what you will!" (14,36). Jesus' acceptance of God's will over his own will in prayer, even though he knows and believes that God has the power to take away this "cup", develops his earlier teaching about prayer. Although disciples are to pray with faith in God's absolute power to grant their request (11,22-24), they must realize that God, though he possesses unlimited power, does not always choose to exercise that power to remove suffering and death. The will of God remains sovereign. But the prayer of Jesus illustrates how one can voice one's deepest fears and concerns with firm faith that God can alleviate them, and yet ultimately submit one's own will to God's will precisely in and through such prayer. Jesus thus demonstrates the power of prayer to enable one to "deny oneself" (8,34) and conform his own will to the sovereign will of God.

The significance of Jesus' resolution through prayer of his crisis over impending death for his disciples and the reader is illustrated by his command for them to "watch and pray" (14,38)⁽²³⁾. After having directed the disciples to "sit here while I pray (*proseuxōmai*)" (14,32) and "remain here and watch (*grēgoreite*)" (14,34), now that Jesus has resolved his anguish over death through prayer (14,35), he can authoritatively command his disciples to likewise "watch" (*grēgoreite*) and "pray" (*proseuchesthe*). That Jesus is able to "pray" precisely while the disciples are only able to sleep and are unable to "watch" indicates that the prayer of Jesus is not only the model for the disciples and the reader to emulate in their own prayer but also the empowerment for their own praying. The sleeping disciples and the reader will be able to "watch and pray" only because Jesus himself has prayed. Although the praying of the disciples and the reader will not guarantee the elimination of their future sufferings and distress (see 13,9-13), the powerful prayer of Jesus has demonstrated how they, only in and through his praying, can conform their wills to the sovereign will of God through their praying, and thus withstand the "test" (*peirasmon*, 14,38)⁽²⁴⁾.

⁽²³⁾ Jesus' command to "watch and pray" (*grēgoreite kai proseuchesthe*, 14,38) is in the second person plural, indicating that it is directed to the group of disciples.

⁽²⁴⁾ On the similar function of Jesus' praying in Luke, see L. FELDKÄMPER, *Der betende Jesus als Heilsmittler nach Lukas* (Veröffentlichungen des Missionspriesterseminars St. Augustin bei Bonn 29; St. Augustin, West Germany 1978) 224-250.

The contradiction that the Marcan readers experience between Jesus' giving his disciples the "cup" of his wine/blood (14,22-25) and his urgent plea that his "cup" of suffering and death be taken away by the God for whom "all things are possible" (14,32-42) enables them not only to empathize with Jesus' crisis over death but also to overcome the similar crises that they will face in and through Jesus' prayer of subordination to God's will.

3. *α⁵ 14,43-52: Jesus is arrested, betrayed and abandoned*

Concluding a sandwich with the two previous scenes, Jesus' betrayal, arrest and abandonment (14,43-52) not only contrasts but also develops both the thematic of union with Jesus in his prayer with his disciples (14,32-42) and the thematic of separation from Jesus in his prediction of his disciples' abandonment of him (14,26-31). In contrast to the bond that Jesus established with those members of the Twelve (14,32-42), especially the privileged three who remained "with him" (*met' autou*, 14,33), Judas, having separated himself from Jesus instead of "being with him" as befits "one of the Twelve" (3,14), is no longer a follower with Jesus but a leader of those against Jesus, who now has "with him" (*met' autou*, 14,43) a crowd with swords and clubs. Judas is then designated as "his betrayer" (14,44) confirming Jesus' announcement (14,42) and underlining the tragedy that one of the trusted Twelve (14,43) is the betrayer. That Judas had previously arranged a signal with the armed crowd, whereby he would "kiss" Jesus as the one they should seize, intensifies the treachery of his betrayal and separation from Jesus. He will betray Jesus with a deceitful demonstration of affection, abusing the bond he enjoyed with Jesus as "one of the Twelve". After he comes up to Jesus and addresses him as "Rabbi", betraying him with a title of respect (9,5; 10,51; 11,21), Judas gives the signal for the arrest as he not only "kissed" him but "kissed him with affection", thus bringing the treachery that separates him from Jesus to a climax (14,45)⁽²⁵⁾.

⁽²⁵⁾ Note the intensification of affection in the progression from "I shall kiss" (*philēsō*, 14,44) to "he affectionately kissed (*katephilēsen*) him" (14,45). M. ZERWICK – M. GROSVENOR, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, I (Rome 1974) 158, suggests for *katephilēsen* the translation: "he kissed him with every show of affection".

But Jesus' arrest, betrayal and abandonment (14,43-52) also develops the theme of union with Jesus in his Gethsemane prayer with his disciples (14,32-42). Jesus' prophetic call for "the scriptures" (*hai graphai*), the recorded will of God, to be "fulfilled" (*plērōthōsin*) (14,49) further demonstrates his subordination to God's "will" that he achieved through his prayer, which serves as a model for how his disciples and the reader can join Jesus in his submission to God's salvific plan. Jesus' exclamation for the scriptures to be fulfilled explains why the armed crowd sent by the Jewish leaders can only now arrest him (14,46). It is not that they have triumphed over Jesus, nor that he is a "robber" (14,48), but that they are playing their role in fulfilling God's scriptural plan (9,12; 14,21). His vigorous proclamation thus echoes and reinforces his previous powerful prayer:

14,36 "but (*all'*) not what I will but what you will".

14,49 "but (*all'*) let the scriptures be fulfilled!"

That Jesus has allowed himself to be arrested without violent resistance on his part (14,46-48) further illustrates how his prayer has enabled him to submit to the will of God as recorded in the scriptures. And his mighty exclamation serves as the signal for the disciples to now fulfill their role in God's plan by abandoning him (14,49-50).

In contrast to Jesus' pronouncement that all of the disciples will fall away from him in accord with the scripture that "I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered" (Zech 13,7 in 14,27), "one of the bystanders", in reaction to the violent arrest of Jesus by the crowd wielding "swords (*machairōn*) and clubs" (14,43), attempts to thwart the metaphorical "striking" of Jesus which will fulfill the quotation, as he draws his own "sword" (*machairan*), "strikes" and cuts off the ear of the high priest's servant (14,47). This anonymous bystander retaliates the forceful arrest of Jesus by violently striking an important member of the arresting crowd, the very "servant of the high priest", and cutting off his ear, thus inflicting him with a painfully humiliating wound⁽²⁶⁾. But such retaliation exhibits a misunderstanding of Jesus' arrest. That the bystander "strikes" (*epaisen*) the high priest's servant with his

⁽²⁶⁾ B. T. VIVIANO, "The High Priest's Servant's Ear: Mark 14:47", *RB* 96 (1989) 71-80.

“sword” indicates his unwitting and futile resistance to the scriptural will of God, according to which Jesus (not the high priest’s servant) is the “shepherd” whom God (not a bystander) will metaphorically “strike” (*pataxō*) with suffering and death (14,27)⁽²⁷⁾. The bystander’s retaliation thus shows his confused and inappropriate response to the arrest of Jesus, which would contradict the necessity for the disciples to “scatter” and separate from Jesus in accord with God’s plan.

But Jesus’ betrayal, arrest and abandonment (14,43-52) also develops the theme of separation from Jesus in his prediction of his disciples’ abandonment of him (14,26-31). As soon as Jesus calls for the scriptures to be fulfilled (14,49), the disciples answer by all running away and abandoning him, thus fulfilling Jesus’ prediction that they would all fall away from him and be “scattered” in accord with the scripture (Zech 13,7 in 14,27). That the disciples all “leave” Jesus signals a renunciation of their discipleship. When the first disciples were called by Jesus, they “left” (*aphentes* in 1,18.20; *aphēkamen* in 10,28) behind their occupations, families and everything to follow him. Now they “leave” (*aphentes*, 14,50) behind Jesus and run away.

The emphasis that “all” (14,50) fled further underlines the fulfillment of Jesus’ prediction that they would “all” fall away from him (14,27) despite the objections and protests of “all” (14,31). And that they “all” ran away stands in contrast to the fact that “all” of them drank from the Passover cup of Jesus’ wine/blood, sharing the bond of fellowship with Jesus on his way to suffering and death (14,23).

Although all the disciples had deserted Jesus, an anonymous “young man” was still “following with” Jesus and he was “wearing nothing but a linen cloth about his body”, meaning that he is not armed with weapons to resist the arrest of Jesus and thus stands in contrast to the anonymous bystander armed with a sword (14,47). The armed crowd “arrested” (*kratousin*, 14,51) the young man just as they had “arrested” (*ekratēsan*, 14,46) Jesus. This young man, then, stands as a possible candidate to fulfill the role of an ideal disciple. All others have fled, but he is still “following with” (*synēkolouthēi*) Jesus, indicating his chance not only to be an ideal disciple of Jesus, but also, because he is unarmed and has been

(27) In Zech 13,7a a “sword” strikes the shepherd.

“arrested with” Jesus, to fulfill Peter’s and “all” the disciples’ forsaken promise to “die with” (*synapothanein*) Jesus (14,31).

But alas, even this would-be follower of Jesus fails to be the ideal disciple who follows Jesus on his way to suffering and death (8,34). Panic-stricken, he leaves behind his only piece of clothing, escaping his arrest with Jesus, shamefully running away naked (14,52). This young man’s abandonment of Jesus reinforces that of all the disciples and illustrates the radical failure for anyone at all to “follow with” Jesus at this most critical time on his way to suffering and death. In accord with the mysterious paradox of God’s scriptural will, it is necessary that all the companions of Jesus desert him to die alone. But that all abandon Jesus in fulfillment of his prediction (14,27) reinforces for the reader the certainty of his promise to go before his disciples to Galilee and renew communion with them after his resurrection (14,28)⁽²⁸⁾.

That Judas has now betrayed Jesus (14,44-45) climaxes both Jesus’ prediction of betrayal (14,17-21) and Judas’ offer of betrayal (14,10-11). And that the crowd has “arrested” Jesus (14,46) finally accomplishes the “arrest” that the chief priests and scribes have been seeking in their plot to destroy Jesus (11,18; 12,12; 14,1-2). Within the network of sandwiches in Mark 14,1-52, then, Jesus’ betrayal, arrest and abandonment (14,43-52) brings to a preliminary climax the thematic of opposition to and separation from Jesus on the part of the Jewish leaders, Judas and the disciples as developed by the sequence of alternating “a” scenes (14,1-2.10-11.17-21.26-31.43-52)⁽²⁹⁾.

Conclusion

We have attempted to demonstrate the intricate narrative structure of Mark 14,1-52, according to which the Marcan implied reader experiences a succession of alternating scenes which form a network of intercalations involving the theme of opposition to and separation from Jesus on his way to death on the one hand, and the

⁽²⁸⁾ C. MAZZUCCO, “L’arresto di Gesù nel Vangelo di Marco (Mc 14,43-52)”, *RivB* 35 (1987) 257-282.

⁽²⁹⁾ The death of Jesus sought by the Jewish leaders (14,1) and the predicted denial of Jesus by Peter (14,30) are yet to be fulfilled in the narrative.

theme of close union with Jesus on his way to death on the other hand. In the reader's experience of these alternating intercalations the thematic of intimate union with Jesus developed in the "b" scenes offsets and predominates over the thematic of opposition to and separation from Jesus developed in the "a" scenes. The succession of "b" scenes in contrast to "a" scenes repeatedly and progressively reassures the reader that, despite the opposition to and separation from Jesus on his way to death by the Jewish leaders, Judas and the disciples, Jesus will ultimately triumph over this opposition and separation because of the intimate bond that he has established and will continue to establish with those who follow him.

And so, despite the plot of the Jewish leaders to arrest and destroy Jesus (14,1-2) and of Judas to betray him to death (14,10-11), the reader is reassured that Jesus' anointing for burial will become part of God's saving activity to be commemorated in the proclamation of the gospel throughout the world (14,3-9). The preparation for (14,12-16) and sharing of (14,22-25) the Passover table fellowship between Jesus, *the* authoritative Teacher, and his special group of Twelve disciples predominate as a sandwich over the prediction of the betrayal of Jesus to death by one of the Twelve (14,17-21) to reassure the reader that this unique Passover meal not only unites the disciples with the saving death of Jesus but promises them a share in the triumphant table fellowship with Jesus in the kingdom of God (14,25). And despite the opposition to and separation from Jesus on his way to death, as demonstrated by his betrayal by Judas, arrest by Jewish leaders, and abandonment by disciples (14,26-31.43-52), the reader is reassured and encouraged both by the promise of the disciples' future reconciliation with the risen Jesus (14,28) and by the powerful Gethsemane prayer of Jesus (14,32-42), which empowers the disciples and thus the reader to remain united with Jesus in their future encounters with opposition, suffering and death in and through his prayer of submission to God's will.

Kenrick-Glennon Seminary
St. Louis, Missouri 63119-4399
U.S.A.

John Paul HEIL

SOMMAIRE

Les neuf scènes de Mc 14,1-52 sont disposées en une progression alternée de sept emboîtements. Telle est l'expérience du lecteur virtuel: le thème de l'union intime des disciples avec Jésus — qui va vers ses souffrances et sa mort — compense, domine même le thème de l'opposition et de la séparation. Cette séquence narrative donne au lecteur force et courage pour rester intimement uni à Jésus dans et par sa prière de soumission à la volonté divine, pour participer au triomphe final de Jésus sur l'opposition, la souffrance et la mort.

Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12,20f)

I. The problem

The story of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (John 12,12-19) is followed by a section, which as such has no direct synoptic parallel (12,20-36). We hear about a group of Greeks, who approach Philip with the request: "Sir, we wish to see Jesus". This request is forwarded to Andrew, and both Philip and Andrew forward it to Jesus. It leads to a short discourse of Jesus about the coming of the hour of the Son of Man to be glorified and about conditions of discipleship (12,23-28a). A prayer of Jesus to the Father to glorify his name is followed by a voice from heaven which is interpreted by the crowd and by Jesus himself successively. His announcement of his being "lifted up" leads to a discussion about the remaining or departure of the Messiah/Son of Man and a final exhortation directed towards the Jews to believe in the Light as long as it shines.

The sequence of ideas in this section is very much disputed. First of all the sudden appearance of the Greeks at this moment has not found an accepted solution so far. But also its relation to the following verses seems to be unclear: what does it have to do with Jesus' announcement of the coming of the hour, when the Son of Man will be glorified? And how does this announcement relate to the words about Jesus' death and the necessity to follow him wherever he goes? And finally: how are the different christological titles (Christ, Son of Man, Light) and verbs (to be troubled, to die, to be lifted up, to be glorified, to draw all to himself) related to each other?

II. Proposed solutions

The internal coherence of our section has been doubted by Bultmann: the verses 24-26 seem to interrupt the sequence of thought, introduced by v.23. Also vv.29f and 33 look like additions

to Jesus' revelatory discourse, added by the evangelist⁽¹⁾. Becker draws his own conclusion from the missing coherence of thought and ascribes vv. 24-26 to the postjohannine "ecclesiastical redaction"⁽²⁾.

Many authors miss a logical connection between the coming of the Greeks to Jesus and the remainder of the section. For Becker they are no longer scenically present from v. 23 onwards⁽³⁾. Bultmann suspects a theological reason for this approach, but rejects the request of the Greeks to see the historical Jesus as erroneous⁽⁴⁾. Brown recurs to historical tradition, which may stand behind the scene⁽⁵⁾ — but how probable is such a reminiscence without any synoptic parallel, decades after the event itself? W. E. Moore suspects that the scene might represent a temptation of Christ to go to the Greeks and preach to them salvation instead of remaining in Jerusalem and suffering death from the Jewish authorities⁽⁶⁾. This proposal does not seem to have convinced successive commentators; the question is not where Jesus goes, but who comes to see him at this moment. A solution which links the coming of the Greeks positively with Jesus' announcement of his imminent death seems to be preferable.

Finally the wording of the little introductory scene merits our attention: Greeks come "to see" Jesus. This wording may furnish us with the clue to our own proposal. Does the expression simply mean: "meet, make the acquaintance of Jesus", even with a connotation of readiness to believe in him?⁽⁷⁾ Or is it equivalent to the desire to see God and find eternal life in him?⁽⁸⁾ In other words:

⁽¹⁾ R. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (KeK; Göttingen 1941, reprints) 321.

⁽²⁾ J. BECKER, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, II (ÖkTbKomm, NT; Gütersloh-Würzburg 1981) 382.

⁽³⁾ BECKER, *Johannes*, 384.

⁽⁴⁾ BULTMANN, *Johannes*, 324.

⁽⁵⁾ R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John*, I (AB; Garden City, NY 1966) 470.

⁽⁶⁾ W. E. MOORE, "Sir, We Wish to See Jesus. Was This an Occasion of Temptation?", *SJT* 20 (1967) 75-93.

⁽⁷⁾ Cf. C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel According to St John* (London 1978) 422, with Liddell-Scott.

⁽⁸⁾ C. H. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1953) 371, with reference to John 6,40.

does it have a similar meaning to Philip's request in 14,8 to see the Father?(⁹)

III. A fresh approach: influence of Isaiah 52,15 LXX

It seems that many of the problems which we have shown in John 12,20-36.37-43 (44-50) can be solved if we acknowledge the influence of the book of Isaiah in the whole section. Let us start with the paragraph in the wider context, where Isaiah is quoted twice explicitly (John 12,37-43), then go on to the nearer context (John 12,23-36), where the influence of Isaiah has been seen by many scholars, and then come to the unexpected "coming of the Greeks" in John 12,20-22.

1. *Isaiah in the larger context: John 12,37-43*

John 12,37-43, together with 12,44-50, brings to an end the public ministry of Christ according to the Gospel of John, whereas verses 12,37-43 state the unbelief of the "Jews" and give a theological reason for this fact, verses 12,44-50 contain a final invitation to believe in Christ. We disregard here the question whether the substance of 12,37-43 may come from a semeia source(¹⁰) and whether vv.44-50 may have been added secondarily to the gospel(¹¹) and read the text in the extant form.

The two quotations from Isaiah in John 12,37-43 emphasize the fact that the "Jews" had not come to faith in Jesus although he had done so many signs. The second quotation takes up immediately the idea of "seeing", which corresponds to the witnessing of the signs, whereas the first quotation concentrates more on the idea of hearing. Let us start with the second text.

There has been a debate as to whether John used in 12,40 the Hebrew text of Isaiah, the Septuagint or some other version. The most probable solution seems to be that he used the Septuagint but modified it according to his own purposes, omitting part of it and

(⁹) Cf. also the invitation to see Jesus in John 1,46. H. STRATHMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD; Göttingen 1962) 188, with other commentators points to this threefold intervention of Philip.

(¹⁰) Cf. BULTMANN, *Johannes*, 346; BECKER, *Johannes*, 408.

(¹¹) M.-É. BOISMARD, "Le caractère adventice de Jn 12,45[sic!]-50", *Sacra Pagina*, II (BETL 13; Louvain 1959) 189-192.

combining it with other texts taken from Isaiah⁽¹²⁾. The main difference from the LXX of Isa 6,10 is that God himself, not Israel, is responsible for blinding the people. This is in accordance with passages like Isa 56,10 or 42,19, where the passive of (ἐκ)τυφλόω is used in order to indicate or at least insinuate God's action in this event.

The strongest verse describing God's responsibility in blinding the eyes of his people is Isa 29,10: πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς κύριος πνεύματι κατανύξεως καὶ καμμύσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν. John may have taken recourse to such parallel statements in order to emphasize that the rejection of Jesus formed part of God's will. We find the same tendency in Mark 4,12, where Jesus' parables themselves lead to the deafness and blindness of the people and to God's decision not to lead them to conversion and forgiveness. We see a similar perspective in John 9,39-41, where Jesus says: "For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and that those who see may become blind". Also here an influence of Isaiah can be recognized.

The pattern of Isaian quotations in John 12,39-41 is completed by a reference in v. 41 to Isaiah's initial vision in Isa 6,1-7. It is after having seen God in his glory that Isaiah receives the task of going to God's people and proclaiming to it the good news, whether they want to hear it or not. According to John, Isaiah saw God's glory present in Christ (which might echo in a way the Targum of Isaiah 6,5⁽¹³⁾).

The other direct quotation from Isaiah in the section (John 12,37-43) stands directly at the beginning. It is taken from Isa 53,1, and in this case there is no doubt that it has been taken from the Septuagint: it is in complete concordance with the Septuagint text, including the introductory κύριε which is without parallel in the Masoretic text and alters the sense of the verse: an exclamation of the speaker without clear addressee becomes a prayer directed to the Lord.

What seems to be important for our argument is the fact that the quotation has been taken from the so-called fourth Song of the

⁽¹²⁾ See for this opinion, with a review of previous proposals: C. A. EVANS, "The Function of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Mark and John", *NT* 24 (1982) 124-138.

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. BROWN, *John*, I, 486f and the corresponding notes: in Jesus may appear the glory of the "shekinah of the Lord" which the prophet saw according to Isa 6,5 Tg.

Servant, Isa 52,13-53,12. It introduces the central part of the song, the description of the suffering, death and final salvation of the Servant. The structure of this unique text has been elaborated recently very carefully by P. Beauchamp⁽¹⁴⁾, so that I can refer to the details of this article. Authors do not agree whether the quotation contains a reference to the Suffering Servant as such⁽¹⁵⁾ or whether John has quoted the verse only on account of the subject of unbelief⁽¹⁶⁾. The former seems to be more probable, not only because of the preceding context, as we shall see, but also with regard to the introductory formula.

It is again Craig A. Evans, who has called our attention to the different kinds of quotation formulas used in the gospel of John for Old Testament quotations⁽¹⁷⁾. Whereas from John 1-12,14 usually expressions from γράφω/γραφή are used (1,23 ξφη), from 12,38 onwards we have introductory formulas speaking of the "fulfillment" of Scripture (five times πληροῦσθαι, once — 19,28 — τελεῖσθαι, two other texts are combined with fulfillment texts: 12,39 with 38 and 19,37 with 36). The reason for this shift of expression seems to be of a theological nature: as the signs in the first half of the gospel point to the heavenly origin of Jesus, so the quotations from the Old Testament in the second half introduce the mystery of the suffering, death and glorification of Jesus. The first quotation, our text from Isa 53,1 in John 12,38, bears considerable weight. The very fact that it introduces the passion of Christ, makes it very probable, that its origin from the fourth Song of the Suffering Servant is not accidental.

2. *Isaiah in the immediate context: John 12,23-36*

After the introductory verses 20-22, with which we shall deal in the following paragraph, the verbs δοξασθῆναι and ὑψωθῆναι seem to form a semantic axis leading through the remainder of our

⁽¹⁴⁾ P. BEAUCHAMP, "Lecture et relectures du quatrième chant du Serviteur: d'Isaïe à Jean", *The Book of Isaiah – Le Livre d'Isaïe* (ed. J. VERMEYLEN) (BETL 81; Leuven 1989) 325-355.

⁽¹⁵⁾ J. LUZÁRRAGA, "Presentación de Jesús a la luz del A. T. en el Evangelio de Juan", *EstE* 51 (1976) 497-520: 504.

⁽¹⁶⁾ R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, II (HTKNT; Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1971) 516, with the majority of the authors.

⁽¹⁷⁾ C.A. EVANS, "On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel", *BZ* 26 (1982) 79-83.

section (vv. 23-36). τιμᾶν in v. 26 can be added. We can distinguish three scenes in vv. 20-36: vv. 20-28a, 28b-33 and 34-36. Each one is centred around a word or speech of Jesus and framed or introduced by a word or comment of the narrator. In the central scene (vv. 28b-33) the voice from heaven finds successive interpretations from the multitude, from "others" and from Jesus, followed by an interpretation of the interpretation of Jesus, given by the narrator. In every one of these scenes, the verbs δοξάζειν/δοξασθῆναι and/or ὑψοθῆναι appear, with a shift from δοξασθῆναι to ὑψοθῆναι:

- scene 1 (20-28a): δοξασθῆναι/δοξάζειν at the beginning (23) and at the end (28a); cf. τιμᾶν (26);
- scene 2 (28b-33): δοξάζειν at the beginning (28b, twice), ὑψοθῆναι at the end (32);
- scene 3 (34-36): ὑψοθῆναι (34).

So the two themes are carefully interwoven with a progression towards the "being lifted up/exalted" (vv. 32ff).

A problem lies in the fact that the ὑψοθῆναι, which Jesus refers to himself in v. 32, is referred by the multitude to the Christ in v. 34, and the latter identified with the Son of Man in the same verse. The answer to this problem seems to be that the text does not represent the minutes of a dialogue between Jesus and the "Jews" of his lifetime, but rather the result of about sixty years of early Christian christology, which led to the identification of Jesus of Nazareth with the Messiah of Israel and the (apocalyptic) Son of Man.

Now it seems to be justified to go still one step further and presume that this eschatological Messiah/Son of Man is also the Suffering Servant from the book of Isaiah. The main reason for this lies in the fact that Isa 52,13 LXX is the strongest text of the Old Testament which contains ὑψοθῆναι and δοξασθῆναι (in the future) and applies both to a central figure of salvation history. The text reads as follows: Ἴδου συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου καὶ ὑψοθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα.

Authors are again divided as to whether an influence of Isa 52,13-53,12 on John 12,(23)32-34 can be accepted⁽¹⁸⁾ or not. Some

⁽¹⁸⁾ In favour of such an influence are: A. VERGOTE, "L'exaltation du Christ en croix selon le quatrième Evangile", *ETL* 28 (1952) 5-23: 7; DODD, *Interpretation*, 247; D. R. GRIFFITHS, "Deutero-Isaiah and the Fourth Gospel: Some Points of Comparison", *ExpTim* 65 (1954) 355-360;

authors see behind the ὑψοθῆναι of John 12,32.34 an Aramaic expression which means at the same time "being lifted up" and "going away"⁽¹⁹⁾, but his proposal seems to suppose a theory about the origin of the Fourth Gospel which cannot be verified. Another argument comes from the school of the history of religions, particularly Bultmann and his followers, and points to gnostic parallels for the "glorification" of "Man"⁽²⁰⁾. Here the opposite seems to hold true: it is difficult to find texts prior to the Fourth Gospel which contain this idea. A third problem might arise from the fact that no explicit reference to the Suffering Servant is given in our text. Here we shall have to look a little more carefully.

First, the context of John 12,32.34 contains a clear reference to the passion of Christ. Johannine research has discovered behind John 12,27-29 the Gethsemani tradition of the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 14,32-42 parr.)⁽²¹⁾: Jesus' soul is sorrowful, the "hour" has come, he prays to the Father and calls him by name. A reference to Ps 42/43 seems to underlie both traditions, as I have tried to show elsewhere⁽²²⁾. The divine intervention is recorded in Luke (22,43 κ*.² D al.) and John (12,28c): in Luke it is an angel, in John it is taken as an angel by part of the crowd. The following verses make the reference to the passion even more explicit (cf. v. 32f).

Second, the wording of vv. 32 and 34 makes a reference to the beginning of the Fourth Song of the Servant even more probable.

W. THÜSING, *Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium* (Münster 1970) 36; G. REIM, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannes-Evangeliums* (SNTSMS 22; Cambridge 1974) 174f; B. CHILTON, "John XII 34 and Targum Isaiah LII 13", *NT* 22 (1980) 176-178; H. HEGERMANN, "δοξάζω", *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* [= *EWNT*] (H. BALZ - G. SCHNEIDER, ed.) (Stuttgart 1980) I, 841-843: 842.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. C. C. TORREY, "'When I am lifted up from the earth', John 12,32", *JBL* 51 (1932) 320-322, who is followed by a number of authors.

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. BULTMANN, *Johannes*, 270; G. BERTRAM, "ὑψόω, ὑπερυψόω", *TWNT*, VIII (Stuttgart 1969; [G. Friedrich, ed.]) 604-611: 609. C. COLPE, "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου", *TWNT*, VIII, 403-481: 471, sees the Johannine conception on the way from apocalypticism to gnosis; G. LÜDEMANN, "ὑψόω", *EWNT*, III (1983) 981f: 982, speaks of a "doketisierende Herrlichkeitschristologie".

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. R. E. BROWN, "Incidents That Are Units in the Synoptic Gospels But Dispersed in St. John", *CBQ* 23 (1961) 143-160: 143-148.

⁽²²⁾ J. BEUTLER, "Psalm 42/43 im Johannesevangelium", *NTS* 23 (1978-79) 33-57: 34-38.

Among all Old Testament texts which in one way or another contain δοξασθῆναι and ὑψωθῆναι, this text has the highest probability of standing behind John 12,32.34⁽²³⁾. A reference to the Targum of Isa 52,13 as proposed by B. Chilton⁽²⁴⁾ is less probable, even if we content ourselves with traditions which led to our existing Targums: it could only explain the idea of "being exalted" and the application of it to the Messiah (or Son of Man, v.14), but not the glorification. Given the references to the Septuagint of Isaiah in the context, an influence of *Tg. Isa* in this passage would need further investigation.

The statement that Jesus will be lifted up "from the earth" may have been influenced by the tradition of the serpent in the desert (John 3,14f; Num 21,8f), as has been pointed out by W. Thüsing⁽²⁵⁾ and Hans-Theo Wrege⁽²⁶⁾. But we have to keep in mind that the verb ὑψοῦν does not occur here, and that the idea of glorification is absent.

Wrege in his thorough study of John 12,20-33⁽²⁷⁾ underlines the connections between the suffering of the Servant and the suffering and exaltation of the Just in Wisdom 2-5, a text which seems to stand behind John 12,32.34. In Wis 2,12ff the Just is seen in the light of the Suffering Servant of Isa 52,13ff; 53. The idea of the exaltation of Enoch may have amalgamated with the destiny of the Suffering Servant. Given the messianic connotations of the former, a clear connection between the Messiah and his own, as found in John, is prepared for here. Parallel figures to Enoch seem to be Joseph and Elijah as representatives of the Just. Against this background the verses John 12,24-26 appear less isolated from their context: the destiny of the master will be the destiny of his own followers, but also vice versa: the Lord will share the fate of his own.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. again THÜSING, *Erhöhung*, 36.

⁽²⁴⁾ CHILTON, "John XII 34", 176-178.

⁽²⁵⁾ THÜSING, *Erhöhung*, 36.

⁽²⁶⁾ H.-Th. WREGE, "Jesusgeschichte und Jünger-geschichte nach Joh 12,20-33 und Hebr 5,7-10", *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde* (FS J. Jeremias; [E. LOHSE al., ed.] Göttingen 1970) 259-288: 271, n.38; nevertheless W. recognizes the stronger influence of Isa 52,13 LXX: ib.

⁽²⁷⁾ WREGE, "Jesusgeschichte", 274ff; cf. also M.J. SUGGS, "Wisdom of Solomon 2₁₀-5: A Homily Based on the Fourth Servant Song", *JBL* 76 (1957) 16-33; E. SCHWEIZER, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern* (ATANT 28; Zürich 1962) 32, 117f.

Before we turn to John 12,20ff, let us elaborate briefly an aspect of the tradition of the Suffering Servant behind John 12,23-36, which is of primary importance for the understanding of the introductory verses. In at least two of the Songs of the Servant in Isaiah (in addition to the last one, to which we shall turn shortly), the role of the Servant for the gentiles is elaborated explicitly. According to the first song (Isa 42,1-4) the Servant will undertake judgment over the gentiles (v. 1), but he will also be the hope for the nations (v. 4). The same message is expressed by the imagery of "light" in the second song, Isa 49,1-6 (cf. 42,16): the Servant announces that he will be glorified (δοξασθήσομαι, v. 5) and receives the promise that he will not only restore the tribes of Jacob and convert the diaspora of Israel, but also be a light for the nations for salvation until the ends of the earth (v. 6)⁽²⁸⁾. Here we are very near to John 12,35f, as has been pointed out recently by R. E. Brown⁽²⁹⁾: "The light is with you for a little longer. Walk while you have the light, that you may become sons of the light". The addressees of this final exhortation are the Jews, but the role of Jesus as light of the world in the rest of the Fourth Gospel has to be kept in mind.

There is a close parallel to our verses in John 7,33-36. After a twofold attempt to arrest him (7,30-32), Jesus says to the Jews gathered in the temple area: "I shall be with you a little longer and then I go to him who sent me; you will seek me and you will not find me; where I am you cannot come" (7,33f). This is a typical instance of double-entendre: The Jews think of a possible departure of Jesus to the Dispersion among the gentiles in order to teach the Greeks (v. 35). For the evangelist and the reader, the announcement of Jesus would point to his imminent return to the Father. But it is possible that the thought of the Jews may have an ironic sense for the readers of John as well: will his departure to the Father not be the condition for the nations to come to salvation? Cf. 12,32: "And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself".

This brings us back to the beginning of our section John 12,20-36. We shall now try to see whether the coming of the Greeks

⁽²⁸⁾ For the relevance of this passage for John 12,20-36 see H. B. KOSSEN, "Who Were the Greeks of John 12,20?", *Studies in John* (FS J. N. Sevenster; NTSup 24; Leiden 1970) 97-110.

⁽²⁹⁾ BROWN, *John*, I, 479.

in order to see Jesus may have to do with the imminent death of Christ as seen in the light of the texts of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah.

3. *Isaiah in the text: John 12,20-22*

The wording of the approach of the Greeks to Jesus echoes in an astonishing way Isa 52,15 LXX:

οὕτως θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλά ἐπ' αὐτῷ,
καὶ συνέξονται βασιλεῖς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν·
ὅτι οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται,
καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν, συνήσουσι.

Many nations will be astonished about the destiny of the Servant, and their kings will be silent, for those to whom the news had not yet been announced about him will see, and those who have not yet heard will come to understanding. The text of the Septuagint differs here from the Hebrew text in its common understanding in so far as the double relative pronoun *οἱ* in 52,15 c.d. is not taken in the neuter sense, but as referring to persons. Whereas the general understanding of the verse is: they (the nations and their kings) will see and hear what they have not yet seen and heard, the sense in the Septuagint becomes: those who had not yet come to knowledge of the Servant will see, and those who had not yet heard (about him) will hear. The reasons for the shift of emphasis in the Septuagint are only partially known. According to R. Hanhart⁽³⁰⁾, who bases his opinion on earlier research, the Septuagint version of Isaiah originated in the period of Jewish persecution in Seleucidic times. Time and place of origin (Alexandria) would make a particular interest in the conversion of the gentiles understandable, especially as the Hebrew text leaves this possibility open.

Now, how can it be shown that John had really Isa 52,15 LXX in mind when he wrote John 12,20-22? Let us give five answers to this question.

First, unlike some of the passages where the allusion to gentiles is at least doubtful, in our text this meaning seems to be beyond doubt. We saw that in John 7,33-36 the reference to the diaspora

⁽³⁰⁾ R. HANHART, "Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Septuagintaforschung", *De Septuaginta* (FS J. W. Wevers; [A. PIETERSMA - C. COX, ed.] Mississauga, Ont. 1984) 3-18: 16.

invited the reader at least to include the Jews of the diaspora in the thought, although "teaching the Greeks" is free from this connotation. In 10,16 the "other sheep not of this fold" could refer either to non-Jews in the sense of non-Judaeans or to Jews from the diaspora or to the gentiles, but the latter seems to be the most probable solution⁽³¹⁾. In 11,52, the comment of the narrator on Caiaphas' judgment, a similar range of answers is possible, but again the universalistic ring is strong. Immediately before our text, in 12,19, the Pharisees say: "You see that you can do nothing; look, the world has gone after him". The word used here (κόσμος) seems to bear a typical Johannine double meaning: in fact, the world is going to follow Jesus: in the next verse, the Greeks come to see Jesus, and Jesus gives a lesson about following him (v. 25f). If John had intended only to include Greek-speaking Jews, the word Ἑλληνισταί would have been more appropriate. A universalistic sense of the Ἕλληνες in 12,20 is also underlined by Christ's "drawing all to himself" in v. 32, as mentioned earlier. Note also his "bearing fruit" (καρπός), a missionary term used in v. 24: "much fruit", and the judgment over "this world" in v. 31. The two disciples referring the Greeks to Jesus bear Greek names. The provenance of Philip from Bethsaida "in Galilee" is noted explicitly, and this could enforce the hint to the area of the gentiles (cf. Isa 8,23–9,1, quoted in Matt 4,15f).

Second, the term "seeing" for "meeting" Jesus is unique in John and rare in the rest of the New Testament. Luke uses it (besides 8,20 and Acts 28,20) in 9,9 for Herod's wish "to see Jesus". But here the verb has a negative tone in the perspective of the narrator, alien to John, so that a dependence of John on Luke⁽³²⁾ can be excluded here.

Third, the nearer context of vv. 23–36 suggests an influence of the Fourth Song of the Suffering Servant as has been shown already (above, 2). Isa 52,15 stands between 52,13, the verse which combines the coming ὑποθῆναι and δοξασθῆναι of the Servant, and 53,1,

⁽³¹⁾ Cf. J. BECKER, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, I (ÖkTbKomm, NT; Gütersloh-Würzburg 1979) 332f, who with good reasons pleads for gentile Christians. His theory of literary layers in John 10,1–18 remains debatable; cf. *The Shepherd Discourse in John 10* (SNTSMS; Cambridge [in press; J. BEUTLER - R. T. FORTNA, ed.]).

⁽³²⁾ In this sense M. GOULDER, "From Ministry to Passion in Luke and John", *NTS* 29 (1983) 561–568: 564.

which follows in John 12,38. Given the fact that there are more instances where whole sections of the Gospel of John seem to rely on coherent texts or groups of texts in the Old Testament, a similar midrashic way of composition can safely be accepted here. For similar cases I may refer to Barrett's commentary⁽³³⁾ and some previous studies of mine⁽³⁴⁾.

Fourth, the section following John 12,20-36, namely 12,37-43, quotes Isaiah twice explicitly: Isa 53,1 LXX in v. 38, and 6,10 in v. 40, as we have already seen (above, 1). As we noticed, the text seems to have been enlarged by other texts from Isaiah, which speak of the "blinding" of Israel by God. So the midrashic character of the whole section beginning with John 12,20 becomes more evident. The text of the Septuagint seems to be the source of John in all instances. The coincidence of Isa 6,9f and 52,13-53,12 in John 12,37-43 does not seem to be incidental, as has been shown by P. Beauchamp⁽³⁵⁾; the two texts seem to mark the beginning and the end of the career of the prophet as seen in the perspective of a redactor more or less contemporaneous with the so-called Trito-Isaiah.

Fifth, a strong argument for the given interpretation lies in the fact that Saint Paul uses Isa 52,15 LXX in Rom 15,21 in a missionary context. It is the only text in the New Testament (according to Nestle-Aland, 26th ed.) where a direct quotation of this Isaian verse from the Septuagint is given (further instances with an allusion to the Isaian text may be found in 1 Cor 2,9 and Matt 13,16: *ibid.*). In Rom 15,14-21 Paul gives the reason for his clear and outspoken letter to the Romans and why he wants to see them on his way to Spain, but also why he had not yet come to Rome: he is sent to the gentiles in order to bring them the good news, and he had to fulfill a great task in the east as far as Illyria, always building upon fresh ground and not on a foundation laid by others. So the word should be fulfilled:

οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ὄψονται
καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν συνήσουσιν.

⁽³³⁾ Cf. BARRETT, *St John*, 27-30.

⁽³⁴⁾ Cf. BEUTLER, "Psalm 42/43"; *id.*, *Habt keine Angst. Die erste johanneische Abschiedsrede (Joh 14)* (SBS [KBW] 116; Stuttgart 1984); *id.*, "Der alttestamentlich-jüdische Hintergrund der Hirtenrede in Joh 10", J. BEUTLER - R. T. FORTNA, *Shepherd Discourse*.

⁽³⁵⁾ BEAUCHAMP, "Lecture et relectures", 344f.

The quotation is in complete correspondence with the Septuagint (only B and a few MSS read the ὄψονται at the beginning and not the end of the first line). The text has clearly the meaning given to it by the translators of the Septuagint and refers explicitly to the gentiles, ἔθνη, mentioned as such in v. 16 and 18.

It can be virtually excluded that John knew Paul and his letter to the Romans. So a direct influence of Rom 15,21 on John 12,20 is extremely improbable. The similar use of the Isaian verse can be sufficiently explained by common recourse to the Isaian text. Since it is imbedded into one of the most important texts in the history of early Christianity, an occurrence more than once in the New Testament is by no means unusual. The first Christian communities trying to understand the passion of Christ must have started early to interpret it in the light of the Song of the Suffering Servant Isa 52,13-53,12. This is obvious from the eucharistic tradition with its ὑπέρ-formula in all of the four gospels and Saint Paul himself (1 Cor 11,24), cf. Mark 10,45 par.; see also Acts 3,13 (Peter: God has glorified his Servant); 8,32f (the eunuch reads Isa 53,7f). The Greek-speaking reader using the Septuagint of the Isaian Song could not overlook ch. 52,15 LXX, where the suffering and death of the Servant, but also his coming glorification and exaltation are linked with the coming of the gentiles, those who had not seen, to see him, and those who had not heard, to understand. John, who used the Septuagint of Isaiah in the context, must have known this verse and has probably used it in 12,20f⁽³⁶⁾.

IV. Conclusion: The text and its readers

If our observations are correct, the coming of the Greeks in order to see Jesus in John 12,20-22 does not stand apart from the following verses. It has been conditioned by the Old Testament background which has to be seen behind the whole scene in John 12,20-36 and also the following one: 12,37-43 with its twofold quotation of Isaiah. The Suffering Servant seems to be the leading figure behind the christology of John 12,20-43(44-50). It conditions also the soteriology of the section: the Servant has to pass through

⁽³⁶⁾ The nearest position to the one defended here is held by KOSSEN, "Who Were the Greeks". Nevertheless he fails to see the direct influence of Isa 52,15 LXX on John 12,20-22.

death, but he will be a source of salvation for all and hope (Isa 42,4) and light (49,6) for the nations. The coming of the Greeks to Jesus is the coming of those who had not seen, to behold the lamb of God (cf. John 1,29.36: does John 1,19-34, beginning with the quotation from Deutero-Isaiah 40,3 LXX in 1,23, form a great "inclusion" with 12,20-50?⁽³⁷⁾). The missionary aspect of the Gospel of John, which has been elaborated recently by Teresa Okure⁽³⁸⁾ on the basis of John 4,1-44, finds a confirmation in the given interpretation of John 12,20-50. Jesus came to save the world and to lead the nations to belief. He himself is the first missionary, and his exaltation on the cross opens to the gentiles the path to salvation.

What effect could John 12,20-50 have upon the readers? Certainly verses 12,20-36 and 44-50 contain a strong and final invitation to faith. It is the final hour. The coming of the Greeks to see Jesus is a sign of this hour. It is the moment of decision and judgment: "now shall the ruler of this world be cast out" (12,31). So the hour has to be used to believe in the light (12,35f.44-50).

Together with the final invitation to belief in Jesus, John 12,20-50 contains also a theological argument for the unbelief of the Jewish leaders⁽³⁹⁾. This is particularly evident from John 12,37-43 with the double quotation from Isaiah. Scripture has not only foretold the death of the Servant for the sake of the many, but also the reason for this death: unbelief of his people. This lack of faith itself is rooted in God's plan of salvation. The audience of Jesus did not just shut its eyes in front of him, but it was God himself who blinded them lest they be converted and believe. Scripture is a witness to the inscrutable ways of God (cf. Rom 11,33 in its context: the final salvation of all Israel!).

A final message for the readers of John 12,20-50 is the invitation to follow Jesus until death in fearless confession of faith. As Jesus dies, the grain of wheat falls into the earth, the disciple must be ready to die with him, to be there where his master is

⁽³⁷⁾ A correspondence between John 12,20-22 and 1,35ff as to content and *dramatis personae* has been noticed by K. TSUCHIDO, "Tradition and Redaction in John 12:1-43", *NTS* 30 (1984) 609-616: 613, n. 41.

⁽³⁸⁾ T. OKURE, *The Johannine Approach to Mission. A Contextual Study of John 4:1-42* (WUNT, 2nd ser., 31; Tübingen 1988).

⁽³⁹⁾ That the "Jews" in the characteristic johannine sense mean "the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem" has been shown convincingly by U.C. VON WAHLDE, "The Johannine 'Jews': A Critical Survey", *NTS* 28 (1982) 33-60.

(12,24-26). So the Father honours him, as he glorified his name (28) and his Son, the Son of Man (23). There are reasons to presume that the death which the disciple has to face is not just of spiritual nature or natural death after a long life. It may well be violent death due to persecution. This results from 12,42f, the last section, where the theme of “glory” (δόξα) is resumed in John 12,20-50: “Nevertheless even many of the authorities believed in him, but for fear of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God”. The text echoes the healing and conversion of the man born blind in chapter nine, centred — as it seems — around vv.18-23⁽⁴⁰⁾: the readiness of the adult person to confess Christ even at the expense of social excommunication. The situation of the church in many countries today helps us to rediscover this dimension of Christian faith. By following Christ in fearless confession until death Christians prepare the ground for the salvation of many.

Phil.-Theol. Hochschule Sankt Georgen Johannes BEUTLER SJ
Offenbacher Landstr. 224
D-6000 Frankfurt am Main 70

SOMMAIRE

La cohérence interne et la place de Jn 12,20-36 en son contexte continuent de soulever de nombreuses questions. L'article montre que la cohérence interne et externe du passage ne peut apparaître vraiment que si l'on perçoit l'arrière-fond isaïen qui innerve narration et discours. Pour Jn 12,20-21, c'est le quatrième Chant du Serviteur, en particulier Is 52,15 LXX qui permet d'entrer dans l'intelligence profonde des enjeux christologiques de la scène et, indirectement, de l'ensemble du chapitre, voire de «l'évangile des signes».

⁽⁴⁰⁾ The seven sections of John 9 (vv. 1-7.8-12.13-17.18-23.24-34.35-38.39-41) seem to form a concentric structure — with strong links between the first and the last, but also the third and the fifth scene — centred around vv. 18-23.

***Ichthys* ed *opsarion* in Gv 21,1-14:
semplice variazione lessicale o differenza con valore simbolico?**

Nella storia dell'esegesi di Gv 21,1-14 la curiosità degli studiosi è stata orientata, in larga parte, verso la decodificazione del numero 153 per i «grossi pesci» (Gv 21,11), mentre ci sembra che non abbia ricevuto chiarificazione sufficiente la variazione lessicale presente nella stessa pericope⁽¹⁾. Infatti poca rilevanza è stata data all'alternanza terminologica, presente in Gv 21,1-14, per cui *ichthys* (vv. 6.8.11) ed *opsarion* (vv. 9.10.13) designano la stessa realtà dei pesci. Nello stesso tempo però le osservazioni a riguardo ci sembrano inadeguate. Così Blass-Debrunner, nel trattare dei diminutivi presenti nel Nuovo Testamento scrivono: «*Opsarion* “pesce” (come cibo), Jo 6,9.11; 21,9.10.13 (ngr. *psari*; ed anche *ichthydion*, Mt 15,34 = Mc 8,7, v. n. 6), mentre in Io. il pesce come animale vivo è *ichthys*»⁽²⁾.

Bauer nota soltanto la possibilità che *opsarion* possa essere identificato con *ichthys*, senza però darne spiegazione⁽³⁾. In modo analogo Boismard delinea lo sviluppo semantico di *opsarion*, quasi inesistente in greco classico e nella LXX, mentre ben attestato nella papirologia del I sec. d.C. Inizialmente *opsarion* indicava ogni tipo di cibo cotto; in seguito il senso del termine si andò specificando per

⁽¹⁾ Richiamiamo in questa sede soltanto i contributi specifici relativi a Gv 21,11: R. M. GRANT, «One Hundred Fifty Three Fish (John 21,11)», *HTR* 42 (1949) 273-275; J. A. EMERTON, «The Hundred and Fifty-Three Fishes in John xxi.11», *JTS* 9 (1958) 86-89; P. R. ACKROYD, «The 153 Fishes in John 21:11 – A Further Note», *JTS* 10 (1959) 94; H. KRUSE, «Magni Pisces Centum Quinquaginta Tres», *VD* 38 (1960) 129-148; N. J. MCELENEY, «153 Great Fishes (John 21,11) – Gematriacal Atbash», *Bib* 58 (1977) 411-417; J. A. ROMEO, «Gematria and John 21,11 – The Children of God», *JBL* 97 (1978) 263-264; B. GRIGSBY, «Gematria and John 21,11 – Another Look at Ezechiel 47,10», *ExpTim* 95 (1983-84) 177-178.

⁽²⁾ Cf. F. BLASS-A. DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen 1984) 90, n. 7.

⁽³⁾ Cf. W. BAUER, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Berlin-New York 1971) 1192.

riferirsi al «pesce cotto». Secondo Boismard, Giovanni ha ben presente tale differenza rispetto ad *ichthys* che designa il pesce vivo, anche se riconosce che in Gv 21,10 la variazione non è chiara⁽⁴⁾. Da parte sua, Bernard ritiene che *opsarion* può indicare sia il «pesce seccato» da mangiare, che il pesce in generale, come *ichthys*⁽⁵⁾. Infine Brown, già a proposito di Gv 6,1-15 scrive: «Qui lo *ichthys* delle tradizioni sinottiche potrebbe essere considerato come il termine più teologico, giacché nel cristianesimo primitivo (II secolo, ma con radici più antiche?) le lettere che lo compongono divennero un acrostico per Cristo»⁽⁶⁾.

Torneremo sulla relazione tra *ichthys* e l'acrostico del Cristo. Tuttavia, a proposito di Gv 21,1-14, Brown contesta la distinzione fatta da Blass-Debrunner tra pesce secco (*opsarion*) e fresco (*ichthys*), ma non motiva l'interscambio semantico, presente nel testo stesso. Così avanza l'ipotesi che ci troviamo di fronte a due narrazioni: *ichthys* farebbe parte della storia della pesca, mentre *opsarion* di quella della colazione con il pane⁽⁷⁾. Forse è necessario chiarire il senso di tale variazione terminologica propria del vangelo di Giovanni, che rimane tuttavia il vangelo più povero di «Wortfeld» del Nuovo Testamento.

I. «Ichthys» ed «opsarion» nella LXX

Nella LXX il termine *ichthys* (c.36x) traduce quasi sempre l'ebraico *dāg*, *dāgā*, oppure *dā'g*⁽⁸⁾. Un'eccezione a tale corrispondenza è rappresentata da Nm 11,22 dove abbiamo: *ē pan to opsos tēs thalassēs synachthēsetai autois, kai arkesei autois*;

Anche in tal caso il corrispondente MT ha *dāg*. Mosè chiede al Signore se tutto il pesce del mare basterebbe a saziare seicentomila adulti. Sorprende così la presenza del sintagma *to opsos tēs thalassēs*. Notiamo infine che in Nm 11,22 si trova il semplice sostantivo neutro *opsos* e non il diminutivo *opsarion*. In Tb la LXX ci offre gli

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. M.-E. BOISMARD, «Le chapitre XXI de Saint Jean. Essai de critique littéraire», *RB* 54 (1947) 473-501.

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. J. H. BERNARD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (Edinburgh 1928) II, 699.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel according to John* (Garden City, NY 1982) I, 246.

⁽⁷⁾ BROWN, *John*, II, 1973.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. Gen 1,26.28; 9,2; Es 7,18.21; Nm 11,5; Dt 4,18; Ne 13,16.

altri soli due esempi nei quali *opsos* viene preferito ad *ichthys*. In Tb 2,2 il Sinaiticus aggiunge: *Kai paretethē moi hē trapeza, kai paretethē moi opsaria pleiona*.

In modo analogo in Tb 7,8 compare il normale accusativo neutro *opsa*. Sia in Tb 2,2 che 7,8 il contesto riguarda un banchetto comprendente del pesce da mangiare. Pertanto sembra che la LXX conservi, in generale, per *opsarion* il senso di «pesce da mangiare».

II. «Ichthys» ed «opsarion» nel Nuovo Testamento

1. Ichthys ed ichthydion

Nel Nuovo Testamento troviamo sia *ichthys* che il diminutivo *ichthydion*⁽⁹⁾. L'episodio che attesta la maggiore frequenza lessicale è rappresentato dalla moltiplicazione dei pani e dei pesci, presente in tutti i vangeli (cf. Mc 6,30-44; Mt 14,13-21; Lc 9,10-17; Gv 6,1-13). Tuttavia notiamo che, mentre nelle pericopi sinottiche compare sempre il termine *ichthys*⁽¹⁰⁾, in Gv 6,1-13 questi è assente; al suo posto troviamo *opsarion* (Gv 6,9.11), forse più corrispondente alla narrazione per il fatto che si tratta di pesce da mangiare. Nell'episodio della seconda moltiplicazione dei pani e dei pesci, presente solo in Mc 8,1-10 e Mt 15,32-29, invece compare il diminutivo *ichthydion* (Mc 8,7; Mt 15,34) ed il semplice *ichthys* in Mt 15,36.

Alla duplice tradizione di Mt 7,7-10; Lc 11,9-13 appartiene il «loghion» della preghiera, nel quale sia Lc 11,11 che Mt 7,10 presentano *ichthys*.

Infine fanno parte del «Sondergut» di Mt e Lc rispettivamente l'episodio della moneta d'oro trovata nell'*ichthys* (Mt 17,24-27; v. 27) e l'apparizione post-pasquale di Gesù agli apostoli, durante la quale gli offrono *ichthyos optoû meros* (Lc 24,36-43; v. 42).

Possiamo dunque osservare che la distinzione tra *ichthys* (pesce vivo) ed *opsarion* (pesce seccato o cotto o da mangiare) non trova corrispondenza nei vangeli sinottici. Sia nella moltiplicazione dei

(9) Frequenza terminologica di *ichthys* nel NT:

Mt	Mc	Lc	Gv	Pl	TOT
5	4	7	3	1	20.

Frequenza di *ichthydion*:

Mt	Mc	TOT
1	1	2.

(10) Cf. Mc 6,38.41.41.43; Mt 14,17.19; Lc 9,13.16.

pani e dei pesci che nel «loghion» della preghiera ci saremmo aspettati *opson*, *opsarion* e non *ichthys*, *ichthydion*. A meno che il fanciullo della moltiplicazione e l'amico importunato, citato prima del «loghion» sulla preghiera non abbiano con se una pescheria! Forse la distinzione fatta da Blass-Debrunner vale soltanto per Mt 17,27 e 1 Cor 15,39. Da ciò possiamo concludere che nel NT, ad eccezione di Gv, il senso di *ichthys* ed *opsarion* è interscambiabile perché, nella maggior parte dei casi, *ichthys* corrisponde ad *opsarion*.

2. Opsarion

Nel NT soltanto Gv conosce il diminutivo *opsarion*, insieme ad *ichthys*, mentre ignora il semplice *opsos* di Nm 11,22 (LXX)⁽¹¹⁾. Notiamo inoltre che *opsarion* in Gv si trova soltanto nei brani della moltiplicazione dei pani e dei pesci (6,1-15) e durante la pesca post-pasquale (21,1-14). Abbiamo già osservato che in 6,9.11 sembra che Gv usi in modo proprio, al contrario dei sinottici, *opsarion*, perché riferito a del pesce che un fanciullo porta con se e che Gesù moltiplica per dar da mangiare alla folla⁽¹²⁾. Ma vedremo che, dall'analisi di Gv 21,1-14, tale conclusione si presenterà affrettata ed imprecisa.

3. «Ichthys» ed «Opsarion» in Gv 21,1-14

Non entriamo subito in merito alla questione dell'autenticità di Gv 21 che, comunque conserva importanti attestazioni di critica esterna, per essere collegato a Gv 1-20. Nella conclusione del nostro studio riprenderemo tale problematica. Dal punto di vista metodologico procederemo per «Sammelgut», ponendo in evidenza gli elementi di continuità e discontinuità, tra Gv 21,1-14 e Lc 5,1-11⁽¹³⁾. Tale comparazione chiarificherà lo stesso messaggio di Gv 21,1-14.

III. Lc 5,1-11; Gv 21,1-14

Il «Sondergut» di Lc ci narra una pesca miracolosa (5,1-11) prima della risurrezione del Cristo, che non trova alcuna corrispon-

⁽¹¹⁾ Frequenza di *opsarion* nel NT: Gv 5x (6,9.11; 21,9.10.13).

⁽¹²⁾ Notiamo la diffusa presenza del verbo *hesthiein* in Gv 6 (vv. 5.23.26.31.31.49.50.51.52.53.58).

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. R. PESCH, *Der reiche Fischfang (Lk 5,1-11/Jo 21,1-14)*, *Wundergeschichte – Berufungserzählung – Erscheinungsbericht* (Düsseldorf 1968); D. A. LOSADA, «El relato de la pesca milagrosa», *RevistB* 40 (1978) 17-26.

denza nel restante materiale sinottico. Rimane tuttavia il fatto che Lc, all'interno di tale racconto, inserisce l'episodio della vocazione «missionaria» degli apostoli, che in Mt e Mc troviamo in contesto diverso. Infatti Mc 1,16-20 e Mt 4,18-22 ci raccontano l'invito di Gesù a diventare «pescatori di uomini» durante una «passeggiata» lungo il mare di Galilea, senza una pesca miracolosa. Lc invece, come Gv 21,1-14, ci narra una pesca miracolosa che precede la «vocazione missionaria».

1. *Elementi di connessione tra Lc 5,1-11 e Gv 21,1-14*

Lc 5,1-11	Gv 21,1-14
v. 4: <i>Epanagage eis to bathos kai chalasate ta diktya humōn eis agran.</i>	v. 6: <i>Balete eis ta dexia merē tou ploiou to diktyon kai eurēsete.</i>
v. 5: <i>Epistata di' holes nyktos kopiasantes ouden elabomen.</i>	v. 3: <i>kai en ekeinē tē nykti epiasan ouden.</i>
v. 6: <i>Kai touto poiēsantes synekleisan plēthos ichthyōn poly.</i>	v. 6: <i>Ebalon oun, kai ouketi auto helkysai ischyon apo tou plēthous tōn ichthyōn.</i>
v. 8: <i>Idon de Simōn Petros prosepesen tois gonasin.</i>	v. 7: <i>Simōn oun Petros ... ebalen heauton eis tēn thalassan.</i>
v. 8: <i>Kyrie.</i>	v. 7: <i>Kyrios ... Kyrios ... (v. 7b) Kyrios ... (v. 12).</i>
v. 10: <i>Homoiōs de kai Iakōbon kai Iōannen yious Zebedaion</i>	v. 2: <i>kai oi tou Zebedaion.</i>
v. 11: <i>Kai katagagontes ta ploia epi tēn gēn aphentes panta ēkolouthesan autō.</i>	v. 19: <i>Akolouthei moi ... sy moi akolouthei (v. 22).</i>

(a) Anche se in Lc 5,5 è Pietro che parla, mentre in Gv 21,3 la specificazione del fallimento notturno fa parte della narrazione, sia Lc che Gv annotano tale situazione di negatività.

(b) Anche se in Gv 21,6 si tratta di una rete ed in Lc 5,4 di reti, la pesca miracolosa avviene in seguito ad un comando del Signore.

(c) Sia Lc 5,6 che Gv 21,6 constatano l'avvenimento di una pesca prodigiosa.

(d) Sia Lc 5,8 che Gv 21,7 annotano il movimento di Pietro verso il Signore, anche se Lc precisa che si buttò ai piedi mentre Gv che si gettò in mare. È significativo che Lc 5,8 rappresenta l'unica attestazione in cui l'evangelista scrive *Simōn Petros*, mentre questo è il modo comune in Gv di chiamarlo⁽¹⁴⁾.

(e) Da entrambi gli evangelisti Gesù viene riconosciuto con il titolo postpasquale di *kyrios* (Lc 5,8; Gv 21,7.7.12), anche se la narrazione lucana è posta in contesto prepasquale.

(f) L'invito alla sequela si trova sia in Lc 5,11 che in Gv 21,19.22, anche se quest'ultimo lo inserisce nella pericope successiva del dialogo tra Gesù e Simon Pietro.

(g) Sia Lc 5,10 che Gv 21,19.22 specificano la presenza dei «figli di Zebedeo». Queste sono le uniche pericopi in cui i due evangelisti designano così i soci di Simon Pietro⁽¹⁵⁾.

Gli elementi di connessione hanno posto in evidenza la stretta relazione tra Gv 21,1-14 e Lc 5,1-11. Le discordanze tuttavia ci permetteranno di valutare maggiormente la prospettiva giovannea del racconto ed il senso da dare alla variazione lessicale di *ichthys* ed *opsarion*.

2. Discontinuità tra Lc 5,1-11 e Gv 21,1-14

Lc 5,1-11	Gv 21,1-14
v. 3: <i>Simōnos ... Iakōbon kai Iōannēn</i> (v. 10).	v. 2: <i>Ēsan homou Simōn Petros kai Thōmas ho legomenos Didymos kai Nathanaēl ho apo Kana thēs Galilaias kai oi tou Zebedaïou kai alloi ek tōn mathētōn autou dyo.</i>

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. Gv 1,40; 6,8.68; 13,6.9.24.36; 18,10.15.25; 20,2.6; 21,2.3.7.11.15.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. invece Mt 4,21; 10,2; 20,20; 26,37; 27,56; Mc 1,19; 3,17; 10,35.

- | | |
|--|---|
| v. 4: <i>Eis to bathos.</i> | v. 6: <i>Eis ta dexia merē.</i> |
| v. 6: <i>...Ichthyōn
poly ...</i> | v. 6: <i>apo tou plēthous tōn
ichthyōn ... ichthyōn
megalōn hekaton
pentēkonta triōn (v. 11).</i> |
| v. 6: <i>Dierrēseto de ta
diktua autōn.</i> | v. 11: <i>Kai tosoutōn ontōn ouk
eschistē to diktuaon.</i> |
| v. 6: <i>Ichthyōn ...
ichthyōn ... (v. 9).</i> | v. 6: <i>Ichthyōn ...
Ichthyōn ... (v. 8)
opsarion ... (v. 9)
opsarion ... (v. 10)
ichthyōn ... (v. 11)
opsarion ... (v. 13).</i> |
| v. 7: <i>Kai eplēsan amphotera
ta ploia.</i> | v. 8: <i>Oi de alloi mathētai
tō ploiarīō ēlthon.</i> |
| v. 8: <i>Simōn Petros ...
legōn ...
Kyrie.</i> | v. 7: <i>Legei oun ho mathētēs ...
ho Kyrios estin.</i> |
| v. 10: <i>Apo tou nyn
anthrōpous esē zōgrōn.</i> | v. 3: <i>Hypagō
halieyein.</i> |

(a) Dal punto di vista cronologico, mentre Lc 5,1-11 si situa durante la vita pubblica del «Signore» (cf. 5,1-3), Gv 21,1-14 appartiene alle apparizioni del risorto (cf. 21,1.14).

(b) Se in Lc 5,4 Gesù invita a gettare le reti «in profondità», in Gv 21,6 viene specificato il lato «destro» presso il quale troveranno una pesca prodigiosa.

(c) Mentre nella narrazione lucana abbiamo due barche (cf. 5,2.7) che contengono la pesca miracolosa, in quella di Gv 21,8 è presente una sola barca. Inoltre la presenza del diminutivo *plouarion* (v. 8), insieme al normale *plouon* (vv. 3.6), pone maggiormente in risalto la dimensione del prodigio. È significativo che mentre in Lc 5,7 «due barche» stanno per affondare, in Gv 21,8 una «barchetta» contiene tutta la pesca.

(d) Mentre in Lc 8,8 assistiamo soltanto al dialogo tra il Signore e Simon Pietro, in Gv 21,7 Gesù viene riconosciuto come *kyrios*

dal «discepolo che amava». Già in Gv 20,4 l'altro discepolo anticipa Simon Pietro nella constatazione della tomba vuota.

(e) Il fenomeno precedentemente notato per la barca, si verifica per la rete. Infatti mentre Lc 5,6 specifica che le reti non si «spezzavano», Gv 21,11 afferma che la rete «non subì alcuna divisione». Ancora una volta in Gv viene maggiormente posto in risalto il prodigio.

(f) I componenti della spedizione. In Gv 21,2 all'unicità della barca e della rete fa da contrasto il numero dei partecipanti alla spedizione: sette persone in tutto. Osserviamo inoltre che mentre per Simone, Tommaso, Natanaele ed i figli di Zebedeo, Gv è attento ai particolari della loro identità, lascia nell'anonimato i due restanti discepoli (v. 2). In Lc 5,3.10 invece vengono citati soltanto tre pescatori.

(g) Non soltanto Gv 21,6.11 specifica il numero dei pescatori, ma anche quello dei pesci: 153. Torneremo su tale specificazione: qui notiamo però la differenza rispetto all'indeterminatezza di Lc 5,6.

(h) Se in Gv 21,9.12-13 si fa riferimento ad una colazione, preparata ed offerta dallo stesso Gesù, con *artos* ed *opsarion*, in Lc 5,1-11 non si accenna ad alcun pasto in comune. Sarà in Lc 24,42 che gli stessi apostoli, dopo la risurrezione, offriranno a Gesù un «pezzo di pesce arrostito».

(i) Una delle differenze più importanti, tra Gv e Lc, è rappresentata dal fatto che in Lc 5,10 Gesù dice espressamente a Pietro: *apo tou nyn anthrōpous esē zōgrōn*. In Gv 21,1-14 invece non abbiamo tale vocazione che, come abbiamo già osservato, è riscontrabile in tutto il materiale sinottico. Tuttavia in Gv 21,3 si trova l'hapax legomenon neotestamentario del verbo *halieyein*⁽¹⁶⁾. Nel brano sinottico della vocazione dei primi discepoli abbiamo: *Deyte opisō mou, kai poiēso hymas genesthai halieis anthrōpōn* (Mc 1,17; Mt 4,19). In Lc 5,10 invece abbiamo in verbo *zōgrein*, riscontrabile ancora soltanto in 2 Tm 2,26 con valore negativo perché riferito all'azione del diavolo sull'uomo.

(j) L'ultima differenza che rileviamo, tra Lc e Gv, è rappresentata proprio dall'alternanza in Gv 21,1-14 tra *opsarion* (vv. 9.10.13) ed *ichthys* (vv. 6.8.11), mentre in Lc 5,6.9 si trova sempre *ichthys*.

(16) Anche nell'AT *halieyein* è hapax; compare soltanto in Ger 16,16 ma con valore negativo.

Gli elementi di discontinuità tra Lc 5,1-11 e Gv 21,1-14 sono forse determinati soprattutto dalla simbologia della pesca, più accentuata in Gv che in Lc. Tale simbologia, come vedremo, determina non solo la presenza dei 153 pesci, ma anche l'unicità della barca, della rete che non si divide, la numerazione dei sette partecipanti alla spedizione, la presenza del verbo *halieyein*, in definitiva l'alternanza lessicale di *ichthys* ed *opsarion*. Anche in Lc abbiamo la simbologia della pesca che diventa modello della missione apostolica. Tuttavia rimane il fatto che forse questa similitudine presente solo in Lc 5,9, rappresenta la chiave interpretativa di Gv 21,1-14. Per questo l'invito di Gesù in Lc 5,9 diventa, in Gv 21,1-14, narratologia simbolica⁽¹⁷⁾.

IV. La simbologia di Gv 21,1-14

Il confronto con Lc 5,1-11 ci ha permesso di comprendere la chiave simbolica della narrazione giovannea, che cercheremo di identificare nella sua globalità ed evoluzione. Dal punto di vista metodologico ci fermeremo alla simbologia della pesca, senza valutare ogni lessema della pericope: in definitiva tale simbologia costituisce la base dello stesso racconto. Forse è necessario precisare che l'analisi di Gv 21,1-14, se non di tutto Gv, si svolge generalmente tra due estremismi che cercheremo di evitare. Infatti da una parte si pongono quanti individuano in Gv 21,1-14 diversi racconti «redazionalmente» combinati⁽¹⁸⁾, dall'altra quanti esaltano a tal punto la simbologia giovannea da cadere in una sorta di allegorismo «alessandrino»⁽¹⁹⁾. A prescindere dalla stratificazione della narrazione, rimane il fatto che la simbologia giovannea va colta soprattutto nella sua contestualizzazione e relazione con la sua teologia. Infine notiamo che la legittimità di un'analisi simbolica di Gv 21,1-14 è determi-

⁽¹⁷⁾ Per quanto riguarda la relazione, in termini di «fonte», tra Lc 5,1-11 e Gv 21,1-14, riteniamo che entrambi dipendano da un'unica tradizione. Infatti pur conservando la stessa griglia narrativa, Lc e Gv presentano un vocabolario diverso. Così anche PESCH, *Der reiche Fischfang*, 60-64; BROWN, *John*, II, 1090.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. BROWN, *John*, II, 1085; PESCH, *Der reiche Fischfang*, 60-64; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1976) III, 410-413.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. soprattutto J.M.J. BARRETO, *El Evangelio de Juan* (Madrid 1979) 892-904.

nata non soltanto dalla relazione che abbiamo evidenziato con Lc 5,1-11, ma dalla logica stessa della narrazione. Ad un'ermeneutica fondata esclusivamente sulla «Formgeschichte», in Gv 21,1-14 emergeranno non soltanto dei racconti mal combinati ma, volendo proseguire nell'analisi, addirittura illogici. Così sembrerà incoerente che mentre sette pescatori non riescono a tirar su la rete piena di pesci (v. 8), Pietro da solo trascina la stessa rete (v. 11). Anche i riferimenti alla colazione risultano incoerenti: prima Gesù chiede ai pescatori se hanno qualcosa da mangiare (v. 5), poi questi trovano sulla spiaggia del pane e del pesce di cui non si sa l'origine (v. 9). Inoltre riguardo ai 153 grossi pesci, non sappiamo cosa ne abbiano fatto, dopo una numerazione così paziente⁽²⁰⁾. Ma per inverso Gesù distribuisce ai sette del pesce che non appartiene ai 153 della rete (cf. *opsarion* del v. 13). Ci saremmo aspettati maggior attenzione da parte del redattore di Gv 21,1-14! Forse soltanto una lettura simbolica, che non misconosce la realtà dei dati, permette di cogliere la ricchezza teologica di Gv 21,1-14⁽²¹⁾.

In modo schematico presentiamo gli elementi simbolici che valuteremo in Gv 21,1-14:

v. 2: *Ēsan homou Simōn Petros kai Thōmas ho legomenos Didymos kai Nathanaēl ho apo Kana thēs Galilaias kai oi tou Zebedaiou kai alloi ek tōn mathētōn autou dyo.*

v. 6: *... Balete eis ta dexia merē tou ploiou to diktyon, kai eyrēsete.*

v. 11: *Anebē oun Simōn Petros kai eilkysen to diktyon eis tēn gēn meston ichthyōn megalōn hekatōn pentēkonta triōn. Kai tosoutōn ontōn ouk eschisthē to diktyon.*

1. I partecipanti alla spedizione (v. 2)

Dal confronto con Lc 5,10 abbiamo rilevato che in Gv 21,2 i «pescatori» sono sette. Tale simbologia è evidenziata dal fatto che Gv aggiunge due partecipanti indeterminati, mentre dei primi cinque

⁽²⁰⁾ Lo stesso Brown propende per una ridicola numerazione dei 153 grossi pesci. Cf. BROWN, *John*, II, 1076.

⁽²¹⁾ Per questo risulta valida la prospettiva ermeneutica di S.M. SCHNEIDERS, «John 21: 1-14», *Int* 43 (1989) 71: «Against this background it seems to me that chapter 21 is to be understood as a narrative presentation of a faith experience that is neither imaginary nor historical in the ordinary sense of these terms, but real and symbolic».

specifica i dati caratterizzanti. In Ap 2-3 avremo sette lettere per sette Chiese: è il numero dell'universalismo sia della missione che dell'ecclesiologia giovannea⁽²²⁾.

2. La rete « indivisa » (v. 11)

Non solo in Gv 21,1-14 constatiamo la presenza di una sola rete, rispetto a Lc 5,6 che cita più reti, ma anche l'annotazione che la stessa rete non « si divide ». Il verbo usato per descrivere l'unità della rete è significativo: *schizein* (v. 11). In Lc 5,6 si trova invece il verbo *diarēgnymi*, proprio dello stracciare⁽²³⁾. Notiamo che Gv non conosce *diarēgnymi* e che, per inverso, usa sia il verbo *schizein* che il sostantivo *schisma*. Il verbo *schizein* si trova soltanto qui ed in 19,24 a proposito della tunica indivisa. Inoltre il sostantivo *schisma* viene riferito da Gv soltanto a quanti non aderiscono al messaggio del Cristo (cf. Gv 7,43; 9,16; 10,19). Pertanto l'unità ecclesiale non è richiamata soltanto dalla tunica di Gv 19,24 ma anche dalla rete indivisa della pesca miracolosa⁽²⁴⁾. Rileviamo infine il senso dei verbi usati per il movimento della rete: *helkein* (vv. 6.11) e *syrein* (v. 8). Gv precisa che mentre sette persone non riescono a tirare su la rete (v. 6), Pietro da solo tira la stessa verso la spiaggia (v. 11). In 21,8 invece i discepoli, senza Pietro « trascinano » (*syrontes*) la stessa rete. Così mentre il verbo *syrontes* è hapax giovanneo, *helkein* appartiene al suo vocabolario⁽²⁵⁾. In Gv 6,44; 12,32 *helkein* viene usato per indicare l'attrazione Cristologica: *Kagō ean hypsōthō ek tēs gēs, pantas helkysō pros emauton* (12,32). Ora però chi assume tale compito di attrazione Cristologica è Pietro (cf. il senso del testamento in Gv 21,15-17).

⁽²²⁾ Cf. anche i sette spiriti di Ap 1,4.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. At 14,14; Mt 26,65; Mc 14,63 dove *diarēgnymi* si riferisce al gesto repellente dello strapparsi le vesti.

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. anche I. DE LA POTTERIE, *La Passion de Jésus selon l'Évangile de Jean* (Paris 1986) 138-139.

⁽²⁵⁾ Frequenza lessicale di *syrein*:

Gv	At	Ap	TOT
1	3	1	5.

Frequenza di *helkein*:

Gv	At	Gc	TOT
5	2	1	8.

3. La provenienza dei pesci (v. 6)

La simbologia giovannea giunge nello stesso tempo ad uno dei punti più complessi e ricchi a proposito dei pesci «attirati» nella rete. Ma un particolare della narrazione sul quale sorvolano molti esegeti è l'annotazione della parte «destra» della barca, come luogo della pesca prodigiosa (v. 6). Generalmente si intende tale specificazione come riferita alla destra, lato della fortuna⁽²⁶⁾. In realtà all'interno di una narrazione che, in alcuni elementi, ricalca lo schema di un miracolo, si addice poco tale interpretazione⁽²⁷⁾. Bernard pensa addirittura che Gesù abbia visto improvvisamente, sul lato destro della barca, un branco di pesci⁽²⁸⁾. Così quanto non osservano dei pescatori alla loro destra, vede il Signore da lontano. Pensiamo invece che questa specificazione sia da collegare alla profezia di Ez 47,1-12. Già in Gv 7,37-39 riscontriamo un riferimento ad Ez 47: il nuovo tempio è Cristo stesso (cf. Gv 2,21) e l'acqua viva è lo Spirito (7,39; cf. Gv 4,23). In Gv 19,34 dal fianco trafitto di questo «nuovo tempio» sgorgano di fatto *haima kai hydōr*, simboli dello Spirito⁽²⁹⁾. La stessa Ap si conclude richiamando quest'acqua viva che scaturisce dal trono di Dio e dall'agnello (Ap 21,1). Gv si mostra dunque particolarmente sensibile alla profezia di Ez 47. Così il lato destro della barca richiama il lato destro del tempio escatologico: è l'acqua viva nella quale «il pesce sarà abbondantissimo» (Ez 47,9).

4. La numerazione dei 153 pesci (v. 11)

La simbologia giovannea di 21,1-14 si fa critica riguardo alla numerazione dei pesci: 153. All'inizio del nostro studio abbiamo osservato che tale numerazione simbolica ha attratto oltre misura l'attenzione degli studiosi. Tuttavia la maggior parte degli esegeti si trova concorde nel ritenere il valore simbolico della numerazione. Non è questo il luogo di fare la storia dell'esegesi sui «153 grossi pesci»; analizzeremo soltanto le interpretazioni più recenti.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St. John* (London ²1978) 580; G. MAIER, *Johannes-Evangelium* (Neuhausen – Stuttgart 1986) II, 382; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 422; J. SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Berlin ²1978) 329.

⁽²⁷⁾ Così anche BROWN, *John*, II, 1071.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. BERNARD, *St. John*, 696.

⁽²⁹⁾ Per la relazione tra Ez 47,1; Zc 14,8 e Gv 7,39; 19,34 cf. I. DE LA POTTERIE, *Studi di Cristologia giovannea* (Genova ²1982) 178.

a) «Curriculum» interpretativo di Gv 21,11

A proposito di Gv 21,11 nel nostro secolo si va sviluppando soprattutto la relazione con la gematria: ad ogni numero corrisponde un valore alfabetico. Tale approccio sembra giustificato dal fatto che questa relazione è riscontrabile altrove nel NT. Così in Ap 13,18 il numero 666 corrisponde in gematria al calco ebraico di *Nerôn Qesâr*, la bestia dell'Apocalisse. Anche in Mt 1,2-17 il numero 14 della famiglia genealogica del Cristo equivale all'alfabetizzazione del nome di *Dāwid* (*Dalet* = 4; *Waw* = 6; *Dalet* = 4). Da questi paralleli emerge che la gematria si applica sia all'ebraico che al greco, soprattutto quando si tratta di nomi propri. Inoltre ci sembra necessario rilevare che questa corrispondenza alfabetico-numerica debba avere aderenza sia al contesto della pericope che ai paralleli letterari. Non è sufficiente trovare un'equivalenza «gematrica» che a noi sembra logica, ma che di fatto non aderisce al suo «background». Per questo escludiamo le interpretazioni che non tengono conto di tale principio. Infatti non ci sembra sostenibile l'interpretazione di McEleney, secondo la quale 153 corrisponde all'acrostico di *ichthys* (*iota* = 70; *chi* = 3; *tetha* = 80)⁽³⁰⁾. Innanzitutto McEleney legge l'alfabeto greco secondo l'ordine ebraico, per cui non *alfa*, ma *omega* corrisponde ad uno e così via a ritroso. L'interpretazione è talmente artificiosa da far emergere il dubbio di una lettura «a posteriori», basata più su Gv 21,11 che sulla gematria ebraica. Inoltre dal punto di vista contenutistico osserviamo che nel NT e soprattutto in Gv, *ichthys* non ha originariamente una valenza Cristologica ma, come vedremo, soteriologica, cioè applicata ai redenti, in definitiva ecclesiologica⁽³¹⁾. Pensiamo infatti che tale simbolo faccia prima riferimento alla realtà dei credenti, per poi assumere storicamente la simbologia dell'acrostico. In Gv Gesù non è mai *ichthys*, pur essendo *artos* (cf. Gv 6,51)! Per lo stesso motivo escludiamo le due interpretazioni di Kruse: 153 può corrispondere a *Q'ehāl hā'ahābā* (= «Comunità d'amore») oppure a *bēnē hā'Elōhīm* (= Figli di Dio)⁽³²⁾. Soprattutto il sintagma «Comunità d'amore» sarebbe

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. MCELENEY, «153 Great Fishes», 415.

⁽³¹⁾ Per la simbologia dell'*ichthys* nel Cristianesimo primitivo cf. soprattutto F. J. DÖLGER, *ICHTHYS, Das Fischsymbol in frühchristlicher Zeit* (Roma 1910) I-V; J. QUASTEN, «Fish, Symbolism of», *NCE* 5 (1967) 943-946.

⁽³²⁾ Cf. KRUSE, «Magni pisces», 144-148.

hapax in Gv. Per quanto riguarda «Figli di Dio», tale denominazione per i credenti è riscontrabile altrove in Gv, ma non si tratta di un nome proprio, come per la gematria di Mt 1,17 ed Ap 13,18⁽³³⁾.

b) Ez 47,10 e Gv 21,11

Per comprendere il valore alfabetico dei 153 grossi pesci ci rifacciamo ancora una volta all'oracolo di Ez 47,1-12. Già Girolamo aveva relazionato Ez 47,10 con Gv 21,11 affermando che 153 erano le specie di pesce conosciuto nell'antichità⁽³⁴⁾. In realtà anche il suo ragionamento era «a posteriori», fondato più su Gv 21 che sulla scienza ittologica⁽³⁵⁾. Rimane tuttavia il fatto che Girolamo aveva intuito o conosceva il «background» di Gv 21,1-14 in Ez 47,1-12. Così Emerton, in base ad Ez 47,10, ritiene come corrispondente di 153 il nome della fonte *'Eglayim: ayn = 70; ghimel = 3; lamed = 30; yod = 10; mem = 40; Tot. 153*⁽³⁶⁾. La sua interpretazione tuttavia non era stata verificata con il contesto di Ez 47 e Gv 21. Così riscontriamo non solo il riferimento alla destra del tempio di Ez 47,1-2 in Gv 21,6; lo stesso numero 153 richiama la raccolta abbondante, narrata in Ez 47,10-12. Ezechiele profetizza che ci saranno reti, ricche di pesci, sparse *mē'en Gedī wē'ad-ēn 'Eglayīm*. Pertanto la fonte di Eglayim rappresenta il «terminus ad quem» di una pesca prodigiosa che riguarda persino il Mar Morto. Così la presenza del Cristo, «fonte d'acqua viva», in un mare che durante la notte non ha permesso di pescare nulla (cf. Gv 21,5), ora offre la possibilità di raccogliere una rete di 153 grossi pesci. Il prodigio atteso da Ez 47, con la pasqua del Cristo, non si realizza soltanto in termini Cristologici (cf. Gv 2,21; 7,37) e pneumatologici (cf. Gv 4,23; 7,39; 19,34), ma anche ecclesiologici. Ci sembra pertanto che la corrispondenza gematrica tra 153 ed Eglayim illumini in modo significativo l'intera pericope di Gv 21,1-14.

⁽³³⁾ Contro la rivalutazione della seconda «gematria» di Kruse da parte di ROMEO, «Gematria», 264.

⁽³⁴⁾ Cf. *In Ezechielem* 47,6-12, PL 25, 474C: «Aiunt autem qui de animalium scripsere naturis et proprietate, qui *halieytikā* tam Latino, quam Graeco didicere sermone, de quibus Oppianus Cilix est, poeta doctissimus, centum quinquaginta tria esse genera piscium quae omnia capta sunt ab apostolis, et nihil remansit incaptum, dum et nobiles et ignobiles, divites et pauperes, et omne genus hominum de mari hujus saeculi extrahitur ad salutem».

⁽³⁵⁾ Cf. la critica a Girolamo di GRANT, «One Hundred», 272-275.

⁽³⁶⁾ Cf. EMERTON, «The Hundred», 88.

5. «Prosphaghion», «Ichthys» ed «opsarion»

L'ultimo elemento simbolico di Gv 21,1-14 è rappresentato dalla variazione lessicale con cui Gv denomina i pesci della rete (vv. 6.8.11) e della colazione (vv. 9.10.13). Generalmente insieme alle varianti *ichthys* ed *opsarion*, viene posto anche *prosphaghion* di 21,5⁽³⁷⁾. In realtà il lessema non corrisponde a «pesce», bensì ad un generico «qualcosa da mangiare». Ne è prova il fatto che *prosphaghion* è hapax neotestamentario e che non compare mai nella LXX. Non abbiamo paralleli per affermare che *prosphaghion* sia una variante per designare il pesce allo stesso modo di *opsarion*. Per questo lasciamo questo termine nel suo significato generico di alimento. In realtà la prima variante per «pesce» è costituita da *opsarion* (vv. 9.10.13), che abbiamo già riscontrato in Gv 6,9.11. Per questo termine lasciamo il significato concreto di «pesce da mangiare», che Gesù stesso offre insieme al pane in Gv 21,13. La connessione sintattica tra Gv 21,13 e 6,11 fa pensare ad un riferimento «eucaristico» contenuto in *opsarion*⁽³⁸⁾:

6,11

*Elaben oun tous artous ho
Iēsous kai eucharistēsas
diedōken tois anakeimenois
homoiōs kai ek tōn opsariōn
hoson ēthelon.*

21,13

*erchetai Iēsous kai
lambanei ton arton
kai didōsin aytois
kai opsarion homoiōs.*

Il parallelismo sintattico tra 6,11 e 21,13 lascia intendere il riferimento eucaristico presente anche in 21,13.

Rimane tuttavia il fatto che mentre la simbologia eucaristica di *artos* sembra esplicita e fondamentale, quella di *opsarion* è secondaria ed implicita. In Gv Gesù non è designato come «vero pesce» allo stesso modo di «vero pane» (cf. Gv 6,32.35). Per questo in Gv 21,1-14, oltre ad *opsarion*, troviamo *ichthys* (vv. 6.8.11). Anche *ichthys* designa del pesce materiale, che però acquista nella narrazione di Gv una rilevanza soteriologica per quanti sono attirati nella rete. La connotazione simbolica di *ichthys*, che designa in Gv i salvati e non solo del pesce materiale, come *opsarion*, diventa chiara in Gv 21,10-11. In Gv 21,10 Gesù non sbaglia a dire: *Enegkate apo*

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. BROWN, *John*, II, 1071.

⁽³⁸⁾ Cf. BROWN, *John*, II, 1077, 1099-1100.

tōn opsariōn hōn epiasate nyn. Egli si riferisce al pesce materiale, concreto che hanno pescato. Ma Pietro in 21,11 *eilkysen to diktyon eis tēn gēn meston ichthyōn megalōn hekaton pentēkonta triōn*. La relazione con Ez 47,1-12 conferma la rilevanza soteriologica per quanti entrano a far parte della rete sino ad Eglayim. Pertanto riteniamo che *ichthys* in Gv non abbia tanto valore materiale di pesce, come *opsarion*, ma soprattutto senso soteriologico ed ecclesiologico per i redenti. La rilevanza soteriologica di *ichthys*, presente «in nuce» già nel materiale sinottico (cf. Mc 1,17; Lc 5,10) ora diventa chiara con tale variazione lessicale, propriamente giovannea.

Conclusione

Ancora una volta la simbologia giovannea si dimostra più profonda di quanto potessimo pensare, senza cadere in allegorismo che prescinda dai dati della narrazione. Tuttavia tale simbologia non si sviluppa soltanto a livello di «molteplici sensi» in base ai quali Gesù è il vero pane (Gv 6,22-65), la porta delle pecore (10,7), ma anche mediante significative variazioni lessicali. Già in Gv 4,6 al *pēgē* di cui parla Gesù si oppone il *phrear* (4,11) cui fa riferimento la Samaritana, per indicare la stessa realtà del pozzo. In Gv 21,15-17 avverrà qualcosa di analogo con la variante *arnia* (v.15) e *probata* (vv. 16.17), per riferirsi alla stessa realtà del gregge da pascere. Così in Gv 21,1-14 la variante lessicale di *opsarion* ed *ichthys* per designare la stessa realtà dei pesci è determinata forse più da motivazioni ecclesiologiche che di narrazioni composite. Altrimenti avremmo più un illogico e goffo racconto che una simbolica narratologia, rispondente alla modalità giovannea di fare teologia. Inoltre, dall'esegesi di Gv 21,1-14, ci sembra che i collegamenti tra Gv 1-20 e Gv 21 si dimostrino più rilevanti che se pensassimo a Gv 21 come di un autore successivo⁽³⁹⁾. La rete di collegamento tra le parti trova un suo fondamento nell'attualizzazione cristologica, pneumatologica ed ecclesiologica dell'oracolo di Ez 47,1-12. Questi non illumina soltanto il senso di Gv 7,37-39; 19,34 ma anche, in termini ecclesiologici, il simbolismo di una pesca prodigiosa, narrata in Gv 21,1-14.

Pontificio Seminario Lombardo
P.za S. Maria Maggiore, 5
00185 Roma

Antonio PITTA

⁽³⁹⁾ Così anche P.S. MINEAR, «The Original Function of John 21», *JBL* 102 (1983) 85-96.

SUMMARY

In John 21,1-14 the use of *ichthys* and *opsarion* is surprising since they both refer to fish. Only a symbolic reading of the pericope is able to see the value of the variation and the meaning of John 21,1-14. Ezek 47,1-12 constitutes the fundamental background of the passage: in the light of the oracle of the eschatological temple we see the meaning of the right side of the boat and the number one hundred and fifty-three for the fish, which corresponds by gematria to the spring of Eglayim. Thus, while *opsarion* designates simply the material fish, *ichthys* refers to the redeemed who enter into the unbroken net.

***Ichthys* ed *opsarion* in Gv 21,1-14:
semplice variazione lessicale o differenza con valore simbolico?**

Nella storia dell'esegesi di Gv 21,1-14 la curiosità degli studiosi è stata orientata, in larga parte, verso la decodificazione del numero 153 per i «grossi pesci» (Gv 21,11), mentre ci sembra che non abbia ricevuto chiarificazione sufficiente la variazione lessicale presente nella stessa pericope⁽¹⁾. Infatti poca rilevanza è stata data all'alternanza terminologica, presente in Gv 21,1-14, per cui *ichthys* (vv. 6.8.11) ed *opsarion* (vv. 9.10.13) designano la stessa realtà dei pesci. Nello stesso tempo però le osservazioni a riguardo ci sembrano inadeguate. Così Blass-Debrunner, nel trattare dei diminutivi presenti nel Nuovo Testamento scrivono: «*Opsarion* “pesce” (come cibo), Jo 6,9.11; 21,9.10.13 (ngr. *psari*; ed anche *ichthydion*, Mt 15,34 = Mc 8,7, v. n. 6), mentre in Io. il pesce come animale vivo è *ichthys*»⁽²⁾.

Bauer nota soltanto la possibilità che *opsarion* possa essere identificato con *ichthys*, senza però darne spiegazione⁽³⁾. In modo analogo Boismard delinea lo sviluppo semantico di *opsarion*, quasi inesistente in greco classico e nella LXX, mentre ben attestato nella papirologia del I sec. d.C. Inizialmente *opsarion* indicava ogni tipo di cibo cotto; in seguito il senso del termine si andò specificando per

⁽¹⁾ Richiamiamo in questa sede soltanto i contributi specifici relativi a Gv 21,11: R. M. GRANT, «One Hundred Fifty Three Fish (John 21,11)», *HTR* 42 (1949) 273-275; J. A. EMERTON, «The Hundred and Fifty-Three Fishes in John xxi.11», *JTS* 9 (1958) 86-89; P. R. ACKROYD, «The 153 Fishes in John 21:11 – A Further Note», *JTS* 10 (1959) 94; H. KRUSE, «Magni Pisces Centum Quinquaginta Tres», *VD* 38 (1960) 129-148; N. J. MCELENEY, «153 Great Fishes (John 21,11) – Gematriacal Atbash», *Bib* 58 (1977) 411-417; J. A. ROMEO, «Gematria and John 21,11 – The Children of God», *JBL* 97 (1978) 263-264; B. GRIGSBY, «Gematria and John 21,11 – Another Look at Ezechiel 47,10», *ExpTim* 95 (1983-84) 177-178.

⁽²⁾ Cf. F. BLASS-A. DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen ¹⁶1984) 90, n. 7.

⁽³⁾ Cf. W. BAUER, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Berlin-New York 1971) 1192.

riferirsi al «pesce cotto». Secondo Boismard, Giovanni ha ben presente tale differenza rispetto ad *ichthys* che designa il pesce vivo, anche se riconosce che in Gv 21,10 la variazione non è chiara⁽⁴⁾. Da parte sua, Bernard ritiene che *opsarion* può indicare sia il «pesce seccato» da mangiare, che il pesce in generale, come *ichthys*⁽⁵⁾. Infine Brown, già a proposito di Gv 6,1-15 scrive: «Qui lo *ichthys* delle tradizioni sinottiche potrebbe essere considerato come il termine più teologico, giacché nel cristianesimo primitivo (II secolo, ma con radici più antiche?) le lettere che lo compongono divennero un acrostico per Cristo»⁽⁶⁾.

Torneremo sulla relazione tra *ichthys* e l'acrostico del Cristo. Tuttavia, a proposito di Gv 21,1-14, Brown contesta la distinzione fatta da Blass-Debrunner tra pesce secco (*opsarion*) e fresco (*ichthys*), ma non motiva l'interscambio semantico, presente nel testo stesso. Così avanza l'ipotesi che ci troviamo di fronte a due narrazioni: *ichthys* farebbe parte della storia della pesca, mentre *opsarion* di quella della colazione con il pane⁽⁷⁾. Forse è necessario chiarire il senso di tale variazione terminologica propria del vangelo di Giovanni, che rimane tuttavia il vangelo più povero di «Wortfeld» del Nuovo Testamento.

I. «Ichthys» ed «opsarion» nella LXX

Nella LXX il termine *ichthys* (c.36x) traduce quasi sempre l'ebraico *dāg*, *dāgā*, oppure *dā'g*⁽⁸⁾. Un'eccezione a tale corrispondenza è rappresentata da Nm 11,22 dove abbiamo: *ē pan to opsos tēs thalassēs synachthēsetai autois, kai arkesei autois*;

Anche in tal caso il corrispondente MT ha *dāg*. Mosè chiede al Signore se tutto il pesce del mare basterebbe a saziare seicentomila adulti. Sorprende così la presenza del sintagma *to opsos tēs thalassēs*. Notiamo infine che in Nm 11,22 si trova il semplice sostantivo neutro *opsos* e non il diminutivo *opsarion*. In Tb la LXX ci offre gli

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. M.-E. BOISMARD, «Le chapitre XXI de Saint Jean. Essai de critique littéraire», *RB* 54 (1947) 473-501.

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. J. H. BERNARD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (Edinburgh 1928) II, 699.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel according to John* (Garden City, NY 2^a 1982) I, 246.

⁽⁷⁾ BROWN, *John*, II, 1973.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. Gen 1,26.28; 9,2; Es 7,18.21; Nm 11,5; Dt 4,18; Ne 13,16.

altri soli due esempi nei quali *opsos* viene preferito ad *ichthys*. In Tb 2,2 il Sinaiticus aggiunge: *Kai paretethē moi hē trapeza, kai paretethē moi opsaria pleiona*.

In modo analogo in Tb 7,8 compare il normale accusativo neutro *opsa*. Sia in Tb 2,2 che 7,8 il contesto riguarda un banchetto comprendente del pesce da mangiare. Pertanto sembra che la LXX conservi, in generale, per *opsarion* il senso di «pesce da mangiare».

II. «Ichthys» ed «opsarion» nel Nuovo Testamento

1. Ichthys ed ichthydion

Nel Nuovo Testamento troviamo sia *ichthys* che il diminutivo *ichthydion*⁽⁹⁾. L'episodio che attesta la maggiore frequenza lessicale è rappresentato dalla moltiplicazione dei pani e dei pesci, presente in tutti i vangeli (cf. Mc 6,30-44; Mt 14,13-21; Lc 9,10-17; Gv 6,1-13). Tuttavia notiamo che, mentre nelle pericopi sinottiche compare sempre il termine *ichthys*⁽¹⁰⁾, in Gv 6,1-13 questi è assente; al suo posto troviamo *opsarion* (Gv 6,9.11), forse più corrispondente alla narrazione per il fatto che si tratta di pesce da mangiare. Nell'episodio della seconda moltiplicazione dei pani e dei pesci, presente solo in Mc 8,1-10 e Mt 15,32-29, invece compare il diminutivo *ichthydion* (Mc 8,7; Mt 15,34) ed il semplice *ichthys* in Mt 15,36.

Alla duplice tradizione di Mt 7,7-10; Lc 11,9-13 appartiene il «loghion» della preghiera, nel quale sia Lc 11,11 che Mt 7,10 presentano *ichthys*.

Infine fanno parte del «Sondergut» di Mt e Lc rispettivamente l'episodio della moneta d'oro trovata nell'*ichthys* (Mt 17,24-27; v. 27) e l'apparizione post-pasquale di Gesù agli apostoli, durante la quale gli offrono *ichthyos optoû meros* (Lc 24,36-43; v. 42).

Possiamo dunque osservare che la distinzione tra *ichthys* (pesce vivo) ed *opsarion* (pesce seccato o cotto o da mangiare) non trova corrispondenza nei vangeli sinottici. Sia nella moltiplicazione dei

(9) Frequenza terminologica di *ichthys* nel NT:

Mt	Mc	Lc	Gv	Pl	TOT
5	4	7	3	1	20.

Frequenza di *ichthydion*:

Mt	Mc	TOT
1	1	2.

(10) Cf. Mc 6,38.41.41.43; Mt 14,17.19; Lc 9,13.16.

pani e dei pesci che nel «loghion» della preghiera ci saremmo aspettati *opson*, *opsarion* e non *ichthys*, *ichthydion*. A meno che il fanciullo della moltiplicazione e l'amico importunato, citato prima del «loghion» sulla preghiera non abbiano con se una pescheria! Forse la distinzione fatta da Blass-Debrunner vale soltanto per Mt 17,27 e 1 Cor 15,39. Da ciò possiamo concludere che nel NT, ad eccezione di Gv, il senso di *ichthys* ed *opsarion* è interscambiabile perché, nella maggior parte dei casi, *ichthys* corrisponde ad *opsarion*.

2. Opsarion

Nel NT soltanto Gv conosce il diminutivo *opsarion*, insieme ad *ichthys*, mentre ignora il semplice *opsos* di Nm 11,22 (LXX)⁽¹¹⁾. Notiamo inoltre che *opsarion* in Gv si trova soltanto nei brani della moltiplicazione dei pani e dei pesci (6,1-15) e durante la pesca post-pasquale (21,1-14). Abbiamo già osservato che in 6,9.11 sembra che Gv usi in modo proprio, al contrario dei sinottici, *opsarion*, perché riferito a del pesce che un fanciullo porta con se e che Gesù moltiplica per dar da mangiare alla folla⁽¹²⁾. Ma vedremo che, dall'analisi di Gv 21,1-14, tale conclusione si presenterà affrettata ed imprecisa.

3. «Ichthys» ed «Opsarion» in Gv 21,1-14

Non entriamo subito in merito alla questione dell'autenticità di Gv 21 che, comunque conserva importanti attestazioni di critica esterna, per essere collegato a Gv 1-20. Nella conclusione del nostro studio riprenderemo tale problematica. Dal punto di vista metodologico procederemo per «Sammelgut», ponendo in evidenza gli elementi di continuità e discontinuità, tra Gv 21,1-14 e Lc 5,1-11⁽¹³⁾. Tale comparazione chiarificherà lo stesso messaggio di Gv 21,1-14.

III. Lc 5,1-11; Gv 21,1-14

Il «Sondergut» di Lc ci narra una pesca miracolosa (5,1-11) prima della risurrezione del Cristo, che non trova alcuna corrispon-

⁽¹¹⁾ Frequenza di *opsarion* nel NT: Gv 5x (6,9.11; 21,9.10.13).

⁽¹²⁾ Notiamo la diffusa presenza del verbo *hesthiein* in Gv 6 (vv. 5.23.26.31.31.49.50.51.52.53.58).

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. R. PESCH, *Der reiche Fischfang (Lk 5,1-11/Jo 21,1-14)*, *Wundergeschichte – Berufungserzählung – Erscheinungsbericht* (Düsseldorf 1968); D. A. LOSADA, «El relato de la pesca milagrosa», *RevistB* 40 (1978) 17-26.

denza nel restante materiale sinottico. Rimane tuttavia il fatto che Lc, all'interno di tale racconto, inserisce l'episodio della vocazione «missionaria» degli apostoli, che in Mt e Mc troviamo in contesto diverso. Infatti Mc 1,16-20 e Mt 4,18-22 ci raccontano l'invito di Gesù a diventare «pescatori di uomini» durante una «passeggiata» lungo il mare di Galilea, senza una pesca miracolosa. Lc invece, come Gv 21,1-14, ci narra una pesca miracolosa che precede la «vocazione missionaria».

1. *Elementi di connessione tra Lc 5,1-11 e Gv 21,1-14*

Lc 5,1-11	Gv 21,1-14
v. 4: <i>Epanagage eis to bathos kai chalasate ta diktya humōn eis agran.</i>	v. 6: <i>Balete eis ta dexia merē tou ploiou to diktyon kai eurēsete.</i>
v. 5: <i>Epistata di' holes nyktos kopiasantes ouden elabomen.</i>	v. 3: <i>kai en ekeinē tē nykti epiasan ouden.</i>
v. 6: <i>Kai touto poiēsantes synekleisan plēthos ichthyōn poly.</i>	v. 6: <i>Ebalon oun, kai ouketi auto helkysai ischyon apo tou plēthous tōn ichthyōn.</i>
v. 8: <i>Idon de Simōn Petros prosepesen tois gonasin.</i>	v. 7: <i>Simōn oun Petros ... ebalen heauton eis tēn thalassan.</i>
v. 8: <i>Kyrie.</i>	v. 7: <i>Kyrios ... Kyrios ... (v. 7b) Kyrios ... (v. 12).</i>
v. 10: <i>Homoiōs de kai Iakōbon kai Iōannen yious Zebedaion</i>	v. 2: <i>kai oi tou Zebedaion.</i>
v. 11: <i>Kai katagagontes ta ploia epi tēn gēn aphentes panta ēkolouthesan autō.</i>	v. 19: <i>Akolouthei moi ... sy moi akolouthei (v. 22).</i>

(a) Anche se in Lc 5,5 è Pietro che parla, mentre in Gv 21,3 la specificazione del fallimento notturno fa parte della narrazione, sia Lc che Gv annotano tale situazione di negatività.

(b) Anche se in Gv 21,6 si tratta di una rete ed in Lc 5,4 di reti, la pesca miracolosa avviene in seguito ad un comando del Signore.

(c) Sia Lc 5,6 che Gv 21,6 constatano l'avvenimento di una pesca prodigiosa.

(d) Sia Lc 5,8 che Gv 21,7 annotano il movimento di Pietro verso il Signore, anche se Lc precisa che si buttò ai piedi mentre Gv che si gettò in mare. È significativo che Lc 5,8 rappresenta l'unica attestazione in cui l'evangelista scrive *Simōn Petros*, mentre questo è il modo comune in Gv di chiamarlo⁽¹⁴⁾.

(e) Da entrambi gli evangelisti Gesù viene riconosciuto con il titolo postpasquale di *kyrios* (Lc 5,8; Gv 21,7.7.12), anche se la narrazione lucana è posta in contesto prepasquale.

(f) L'invito alla sequela si trova sia in Lc 5,11 che in Gv 21,19.22, anche se quest'ultimo lo inserisce nella pericope successiva del dialogo tra Gesù e Simon Pietro.

(g) Sia Lc 5,10 che Gv 21,19.22 specificano la presenza dei «figli di Zebedeo». Queste sono le uniche pericopi in cui i due evangelisti designano così i soci di Simon Pietro⁽¹⁵⁾.

Gli elementi di connessione hanno posto in evidenza la stretta relazione tra Gv 21,1-14 e Lc 5,1-11. Le discordanze tuttavia ci permetteranno di valutare maggiormente la prospettiva giovannea del racconto ed il senso da dare alla variazione lessicale di *ichthys* ed *opsarion*.

2. Discontinuità tra Lc 5,1-11 e Gv 21,1-14

Lc 5,1-11	Gv 21,1-14
v. 3: <i>Simōnos ... Iakōbon kai Iōannēn</i> (v. 10).	v. 2: <i>Ēsan homou Simōn Petros kai Thōmas ho legomenos Didymos kai Nathanaēl ho apo Kana thēs Galilaias kai oi tou Zebedaïou kai alloi ek tōn mathētōn autou dyo.</i>

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. Gv 1,40; 6,8.68; 13,6.9.24.36; 18,10.15.25; 20,2.6; 21,2.3.7.11.15.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. invece Mt 4,21; 10,2; 20,20; 26,37; 27,56; Mc 1,19; 3,17; 10,35.

- | | |
|--|---|
| v. 4: <i>Eis to bathos.</i> | v. 6: <i>Eis ta dexia merē.</i> |
| v. 6: <i>...Ichthyōn
poly ...</i> | v. 6: <i>apo tou plēthous tōn
ichthyōn ... ichthyōn
megalōn hekaton
pentēkonta triōn (v. 11).</i> |
| v. 6: <i>Dierrēseto de ta
diktua autōn.</i> | v. 11: <i>Kai tosoutōn ontōn ouk
eschistē to diktuaon.</i> |
| v. 6: <i>Ichthyōn ...
ichthyōn ... (v. 9).</i> | v. 6: <i>Ichthyōn ...
Ichthyōn ... (v. 8)
opsarion ... (v. 9)
opsarion ... (v. 10)
ichthyōn ... (v. 11)
opsarion ... (v. 13).</i> |
| v. 7: <i>Kai eplēsan amphotera
ta ploia.</i> | v. 8: <i>Oi de alloi mathētai
tō ploiarīō ēlthon.</i> |
| v. 8: <i>Simōn Petros ...
legōn ...
Kyrie.</i> | v. 7: <i>Legei oun ho mathētēs ...
ho Kyrios estin.</i> |
| v. 10: <i>Apo tou nyn
anthrōpous esē zōgrōn.</i> | v. 3: <i>Hypagō
halieyein.</i> |

(a) Dal punto di vista cronologico, mentre Lc 5,1-11 si situa durante la vita pubblica del «Signore» (cf. 5,1-3), Gv 21,1-14 appartiene alle apparizioni del risorto (cf. 21,1.14).

(b) Se in Lc 5,4 Gesù invita a gettare le reti «in profondità», in Gv 21,6 viene specificato il lato «destro» presso il quale troveranno una pesca prodigiosa.

(c) Mentre nella narrazione lucana abbiamo due barche (cf. 5,2.7) che contengono la pesca miracolosa, in quella di Gv 21,8 è presente una sola barca. Inoltre la presenza del diminutivo *ploiaron* (v. 8), insieme al normale *ploion* (vv. 3.6), pone maggiormente in risalto la dimensione del prodigio. È significativo che mentre in Lc 5,7 «due barche» stanno per affondare, in Gv 21,8 una «barchetta» contiene tutta la pesca.

(d) Mentre in Lc 8,8 assistiamo soltanto al dialogo tra il Signore e Simon Pietro, in Gv 21,7 Gesù viene riconosciuto come *kyrios*

dal «discepolo che amava». Già in Gv 20,4 l'altro discepolo anticipa Simon Pietro nella constatazione della tomba vuota.

(e) Il fenomeno precedentemente notato per la barca, si verifica per la rete. Infatti mentre Lc 5,6 specifica che le reti non si «spezzavano», Gv 21,11 afferma che la rete «non subì alcuna divisione». Ancora una volta in Gv viene maggiormente posto in risalto il prodigio.

(f) I componenti della spedizione. In Gv 21,2 all'unicità della barca e della rete fa da contrasto il numero dei partecipanti alla spedizione: sette persone in tutto. Osserviamo inoltre che mentre per Simone, Tommaso, Natanaele ed i figli di Zebedeo, Gv è attento ai particolari della loro identità, lascia nell'anonimato i due restanti discepoli (v. 2). In Lc 5,3.10 invece vengono citati soltanto tre pescatori.

(g) Non soltanto Gv 21,6.11 specifica il numero dei pescatori, ma anche quello dei pesci: 153. Torneremo su tale specificazione: qui notiamo però la differenza rispetto all'indeterminatezza di Lc 5,6.

(h) Se in Gv 21,9.12-13 si fa riferimento ad una colazione, preparata ed offerta dallo stesso Gesù, con *artos* ed *opsarion*, in Lc 5,1-11 non si accenna ad alcun pasto in comune. Sarà in Lc 24,42 che gli stessi apostoli, dopo la risurrezione, offriranno a Gesù un «pezzo di pesce arrostito».

(i) Una delle differenze più importanti, tra Gv e Lc, è rappresentata dal fatto che in Lc 5,10 Gesù dice espressamente a Pietro: *apo tou nyn anthrōpous esē zōgrōn*. In Gv 21,1-14 invece non abbiamo tale vocazione che, come abbiamo già osservato, è riscontrabile in tutto il materiale sinottico. Tuttavia in Gv 21,3 si trova l'hapax legomenon neotestamentario del verbo *halieyein*⁽¹⁶⁾. Nel brano sinottico della vocazione dei primi discepoli abbiamo: *Deyte opisō mou, kai poiēso hymas genesthai halieis anthrōpōn* (Mc 1,17; Mt 4,19). In Lc 5,10 invece abbiamo in verbo *zōgrein*, riscontrabile ancora soltanto in 2 Tm 2,26 con valore negativo perché riferito all'azione del diavolo sull'uomo.

(j) L'ultima differenza che rileviamo, tra Lc e Gv, è rappresentata proprio dall'alternanza in Gv 21,1-14 tra *opsarion* (vv. 9.10.13) ed *ichthys* (vv. 6.8.11), mentre in Lc 5,6.9 si trova sempre *ichthys*.

(16) Anche nell'AT *halieyein* è hapax; compare soltanto in Ger 16,16 ma con valore negativo.

Gli elementi di discontinuità tra Lc 5,1-11 e Gv 21,1-14 sono forse determinati soprattutto dalla simbologia della pesca, più accentuata in Gv che in Lc. Tale simbologia, come vedremo, determina non solo la presenza dei 153 pesci, ma anche l'unicità della barca, della rete che non si divide, la numerazione dei sette partecipanti alla spedizione, la presenza del verbo *halieyein*, in definitiva l'alternanza lessicale di *ichthys* ed *opsarion*. Anche in Lc abbiamo la simbologia della pesca che diventa modello della missione apostolica. Tuttavia rimane il fatto che forse questa similitudine presente solo in Lc 5,9, rappresenta la chiave interpretativa di Gv 21,1-14. Per questo l'invito di Gesù in Lc 5,9 diventa, in Gv 21,1-14, narratologia simbolica⁽¹⁷⁾.

IV. La simbologia di Gv 21,1-14

Il confronto con Lc 5,1-11 ci ha permesso di comprendere la chiave simbolica della narrazione giovannea, che cercheremo di identificare nella sua globalità ed evoluzione. Dal punto di vista metodologico ci fermeremo alla simbologia della pesca, senza valutare ogni lessema della pericope: in definitiva tale simbologia costituisce la base dello stesso racconto. Forse è necessario precisare che l'analisi di Gv 21,1-14, se non di tutto Gv, si svolge generalmente tra due estremismi che cercheremo di evitare. Infatti da una parte si pongono quanti individuano in Gv 21,1-14 diversi racconti «redazionalmente» combinati⁽¹⁸⁾, dall'altra quanti esaltano a tal punto la simbologia giovannea da cadere in una sorta di allegorismo «alessandrino»⁽¹⁹⁾. A prescindere dalla stratificazione della narrazione, rimane il fatto che la simbologia giovannea va colta soprattutto nella sua contestualizzazione e relazione con la sua teologia. Infine notiamo che la legittimità di un'analisi simbolica di Gv 21,1-14 è determi-

⁽¹⁷⁾ Per quanto riguarda la relazione, in termini di «fonte», tra Lc 5,1-11 e Gv 21,1-14, riteniamo che entrambi dipendano da un'unica tradizione. Infatti pur conservando la stessa griglia narrativa, Lc e Gv presentano un vocabolario diverso. Così anche PESCH, *Der reiche Fischfang*, 60-64; BROWN, *John*, II, 1090.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. BROWN, *John*, II, 1085; PESCH, *Der reiche Fischfang*, 60-64; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1976) III, 410-413.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. soprattutto J.M.J. BARRETO, *El Evangelio de Juan* (Madrid 1979) 892-904.

nata non soltanto dalla relazione che abbiamo evidenziato con Lc 5,1-11, ma dalla logica stessa della narrazione. Ad un'ermeneutica fondata esclusivamente sulla «Formgeschichte», in Gv 21,1-14 emergeranno non soltanto dei racconti mal combinati ma, volendo proseguire nell'analisi, addirittura illogici. Così sembrerà incoerente che mentre sette pescatori non riescono a tirar su la rete piena di pesci (v. 8), Pietro da solo trascina la stessa rete (v. 11). Anche i riferimenti alla colazione risultano incoerenti: prima Gesù chiede ai pescatori se hanno qualcosa da mangiare (v. 5), poi questi trovano sulla spiaggia del pane e del pesce di cui non si sa l'origine (v. 9). Inoltre riguardo ai 153 grossi pesci, non sappiamo cosa ne abbiano fatto, dopo una numerazione così paziente⁽²⁰⁾. Ma per inverso Gesù distribuisce ai sette del pesce che non appartiene ai 153 della rete (cf. *opsarion* del v. 13). Ci saremmo aspettati maggior attenzione da parte del redattore di Gv 21,1-14! Forse soltanto una lettura simbolica, che non misconosce la realtà dei dati, permette di cogliere la ricchezza teologica di Gv 21,1-14⁽²¹⁾.

In modo schematico presentiamo gli elementi simbolici che valuteremo in Gv 21,1-14:

v. 2: *Ēsan homou Simōn Petros kai Thōmas ho legomenos Didymos kai Nathanaēl ho apo Kana thēs Galilaias kai oi tou Zebedaiou kai alloi ek tōn mathētōn autou dyo.*

v. 6: *... Balete eis ta dexia merē tou ploiou to diktyon, kai eyrēsete.*

v. 11: *Anebē oun Simōn Petros kai eilkysen to diktyon eis tēn gēn meston ichthyōn megalōn hekatōn pentēkonta triōn. Kai tosoutōn ontōn ouk eschisthē to diktyon.*

1. *I partecipanti alla spedizione (v. 2)*

Dal confronto con Lc 5,10 abbiamo rilevato che in Gv 21,2 i «pescatori» sono sette. Tale simbologia è evidenziata dal fatto che Gv aggiunge due partecipanti indeterminati, mentre dei primi cinque

⁽²⁰⁾ Lo stesso Brown propende per una ridicola numerazione dei 153 grossi pesci. Cf. BROWN, *John*, II, 1076.

⁽²¹⁾ Per questo risulta valida la prospettiva ermeneutica di S.M. SCHNEIDERS, «John 21: 1-14», *Int* 43 (1989) 71: «Against this background it seems to me that chapter 21 is to be understood as a narrative presentation of a faith experience that is neither imaginary nor historical in the ordinary sense of these terms, but real and symbolic».

specifica i dati caratterizzanti. In Ap 2-3 avremo sette lettere per sette Chiese: è il numero dell'universalismo sia della missione che dell'ecclesiologia giovannea⁽²²⁾.

2. La rete « indivisa » (v. 11)

Non solo in Gv 21,1-14 constatiamo la presenza di una sola rete, rispetto a Lc 5,6 che cita più reti, ma anche l'annotazione che la stessa rete non « si divide ». Il verbo usato per descrivere l'unità della rete è significativo: *schizein* (v. 11). In Lc 5,6 si trova invece il verbo *diarēgnymi*, proprio dello stracciare⁽²³⁾. Notiamo che Gv non conosce *diarēgnymi* e che, per inverso, usa sia il verbo *schizein* che il sostantivo *schisma*. Il verbo *schizein* si trova soltanto qui ed in 19,24 a proposito della tunica indivisa. Inoltre il sostantivo *schisma* viene riferito da Gv soltanto a quanti non aderiscono al messaggio del Cristo (cf. Gv 7,43; 9,16; 10,19). Pertanto l'unità ecclesiale non è richiamata soltanto dalla tunica di Gv 19,24 ma anche dalla rete indivisa della pesca miracolosa⁽²⁴⁾. Rileviamo infine il senso dei verbi usati per il movimento della rete: *helkein* (vv. 6.11) e *syrein* (v. 8). Gv precisa che mentre sette persone non riescono a tirare su la rete (v. 6), Pietro da solo tira la stessa verso la spiaggia (v. 11). In 21,8 invece i discepoli, senza Pietro « trascinano » (*syrontes*) la stessa rete. Così mentre il verbo *syrontes* è hapax giovanneo, *helkein* appartiene al suo vocabolario⁽²⁵⁾. In Gv 6,44; 12,32 *helkein* viene usato per indicare l'attrazione Cristologica: *Kagō ean hypsōthō ek tēs gēs, pantas helkysō pros emauton* (12,32). Ora però chi assume tale compito di attrazione Cristologica è Pietro (cf. il senso del testamento in Gv 21,15-17).

⁽²²⁾ Cf. anche i sette spiriti di Ap 1,4.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. At 14,14; Mt 26,65; Mc 14,63 dove *diarēgnymi* si riferisce al gesto repellente dello strapparsi le vesti.

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. anche I. DE LA POTTERIE, *La Passion de Jésus selon l'Évangile de Jean* (Paris 1986) 138-139.

⁽²⁵⁾ Frequenza lessicale di *syrein*:

Gv	At	Ap	TOT
1	3	1	5.

Frequenza di *helkein*:

Gv	At	Gc	TOT
5	2	1	8.

3. La provenienza dei pesci (v. 6)

La simbologia giovannea giunge nello stesso tempo ad uno dei punti più complessi e ricchi a proposito dei pesci «attirati» nella rete. Ma un particolare della narrazione sul quale sorvolano molti esegeti è l'annotazione della parte «destra» della barca, come luogo della pesca prodigiosa (v. 6). Generalmente si intende tale specificazione come riferita alla destra, lato della fortuna⁽²⁶⁾. In realtà all'interno di una narrazione che, in alcuni elementi, ricalca lo schema di un miracolo, si addice poco tale interpretazione⁽²⁷⁾. Bernard pensa addirittura che Gesù abbia visto improvvisamente, sul lato destro della barca, un branco di pesci⁽²⁸⁾. Così quanto non osservano dei pescatori alla loro destra, vede il Signore da lontano. Pensiamo invece che questa specificazione sia da collegare alla profezia di Ez 47,1-12. Già in Gv 7,37-39 riscontriamo un riferimento ad Ez 47: il nuovo tempio è Cristo stesso (cf. Gv 2,21) e l'acqua viva è lo Spirito (7,39; cf. Gv 4,23). In Gv 19,34 dal fianco trafitto di questo «nuovo tempio» sgorgano di fatto *haima kai hydōr*, simboli dello Spirito⁽²⁹⁾. La stessa Ap si conclude richiamando quest'acqua viva che scaturisce dal trono di Dio e dall'agnello (Ap 21,1). Gv si mostra dunque particolarmente sensibile alla profezia di Ez 47. Così il lato destro della barca richiama il lato destro del tempio escatologico: è l'acqua viva nella quale «il pesce sarà abbondantissimo» (Ez 47,9).

4. La numerazione dei 153 pesci (v. 11)

La simbologia giovannea di 21,1-14 si fa critica riguardo alla numerazione dei pesci: 153. All'inizio del nostro studio abbiamo osservato che tale numerazione simbolica ha attratto oltre misura l'attenzione degli studiosi. Tuttavia la maggior parte degli esegeti si trova concorde nel ritenere il valore simbolico della numerazione. Non è questo il luogo di fare la storia dell'esegesi sui «153 grossi pesci»; analizzeremo soltanto le interpretazioni più recenti.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St. John* (London ²1978) 580; G. MAIER, *Johannes-Evangelium* (Neuhausen – Stuttgart 1986) II, 382; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 422; J. SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Berlin ²1978) 329.

⁽²⁷⁾ Così anche BROWN, *John*, II, 1071.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. BERNARD, *St. John*, 696.

⁽²⁹⁾ Per la relazione tra Ez 47,1; Zc 14,8 e Gv 7,39; 19,34 cf. I. DE LA POTTERIE, *Studi di Cristologia giovannea* (Genova ²1982) 178.

a) «Curriculum» interpretativo di Gv 21,11

A proposito di Gv 21,11 nel nostro secolo si va sviluppando soprattutto la relazione con la gematria: ad ogni numero corrisponde un valore alfabetico. Tale approccio sembra giustificato dal fatto che questa relazione è riscontrabile altrove nel NT. Così in Ap 13,18 il numero 666 corrisponde in gematria al calco ebraico di *Nerôn Qesâr*, la bestia dell'Apocalisse. Anche in Mt 1,2-17 il numero 14 della famiglia genealogica del Cristo equivale all'alfabetizzazione del nome di *Dāwid* (*Dalet* = 4; *Waw* = 6; *Dalet* = 4). Da questi paralleli emerge che la gematria si applica sia all'ebraico che al greco, soprattutto quando si tratta di nomi propri. Inoltre ci sembra necessario rilevare che questa corrispondenza alfabetico-numerica debba avere aderenza sia al contesto della pericope che ai paralleli letterari. Non è sufficiente trovare un'equivalenza «gematrica» che a noi sembra logica, ma che di fatto non aderisce al suo «background». Per questo escludiamo le interpretazioni che non tengono conto di tale principio. Infatti non ci sembra sostenibile l'interpretazione di McEleney, secondo la quale 153 corrisponde all'acrostico di *ichthys* (*iota* = 70; *chi* = 3; *tetha* = 80)⁽³⁰⁾. Innanzitutto McEleney legge l'alfabeto greco secondo l'ordine ebraico, per cui non *alfa*, ma *omega* corrisponde ad uno e così via a ritroso. L'interpretazione è talmente artificiosa da far emergere il dubbio di una lettura «a posteriori», basata più su Gv 21,11 che sulla gematria ebraica. Inoltre dal punto di vista contenutistico osserviamo che nel NT e soprattutto in Gv, *ichthys* non ha originariamente una valenza Cristologica ma, come vedremo, soteriologica, cioè applicata ai redenti, in definitiva ecclesiologica⁽³¹⁾. Pensiamo infatti che tale simbolo faccia prima riferimento alla realtà dei credenti, per poi assumere storicamente la simbologia dell'acrostico. In Gv Gesù non è mai *ichthys*, pur essendo *artos* (cf. Gv 6,51)! Per lo stesso motivo escludiamo le due interpretazioni di Kruse: 153 può corrispondere a *Q'ehāl hā'ahābā* (= «Comunità d'amore») oppure a *bēnē hā'Elōhīm* (= Figli di Dio)⁽³²⁾. Soprattutto il sintagma «Comunità d'amore» sarebbe

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. MCELENEY, «153 Great Fishes», 415.

⁽³¹⁾ Per la simbologia dell'*ichthys* nel Cristianesimo primitivo cf. soprattutto F. J. DÖLGER, *ICHTHYS, Das Fischsymbol in frühchristlicher Zeit* (Roma 1910) I-V; J. QUASTEN, «Fish, Symbolism of», *NCE* 5 (1967) 943-946.

⁽³²⁾ Cf. KRUSE, «Magni pisces», 144-148.

hapax in Gv. Per quanto riguarda «Figli di Dio», tale denominazione per i credenti è riscontrabile altrove in Gv, ma non si tratta di un nome proprio, come per la gematria di Mt 1,17 ed Ap 13,18⁽³³⁾.

b) Ez 47,10 e Gv 21,11

Per comprendere il valore alfabetico dei 153 grossi pesci ci rifacciamo ancora una volta all'oracolo di Ez 47,1-12. Già Girolamo aveva relazionato Ez 47,10 con Gv 21,11 affermando che 153 erano le specie di pesce conosciuto nell'antichità⁽³⁴⁾. In realtà anche il suo ragionamento era «a posteriori», fondato più su Gv 21 che sulla scienza ittologica⁽³⁵⁾. Rimane tuttavia il fatto che Girolamo aveva intuito o conosceva il «background» di Gv 21,1-14 in Ez 47,1-12. Così Emerton, in base ad Ez 47,10, ritiene come corrispondente di 153 il nome della fonte *'Eglayim: ayn = 70; ghimel = 3; lamed = 30; yod = 10; mem = 40; Tot. 153*⁽³⁶⁾. La sua interpretazione tuttavia non era stata verificata con il contesto di Ez 47 e Gv 21. Così riscontriamo non solo il riferimento alla destra del tempio di Ez 47,1-2 in Gv 21,6; lo stesso numero 153 richiama la raccolta abbondante, narrata in Ez 47,10-12. Ezechiele profetizza che ci saranno reti, ricche di pesci, sparse *mē'en Gedī wē'ad-ēn 'Eglayīm*. Pertanto la fonte di Eglayim rappresenta il «terminus ad quem» di una pesca prodigiosa che riguarda persino il Mar Morto. Così la presenza del Cristo, «fonte d'acqua viva», in un mare che durante la notte non ha permesso di pescare nulla (cf. Gv 21,5), ora offre la possibilità di raccogliere una rete di 153 grossi pesci. Il prodigio atteso da Ez 47, con la pasqua del Cristo, non si realizza soltanto in termini Cristologici (cf. Gv 2,21; 7,37) e pneumatologici (cf. Gv 4,23; 7,39; 19,34), ma anche ecclesiologici. Ci sembra pertanto che la corrispondenza gematrica tra 153 ed Eglayim illumini in modo significativo l'intera pericope di Gv 21,1-14.

⁽³³⁾ Contro la rivalutazione della seconda «gematria» di Kruse da parte di ROMEO, «Gematria», 264.

⁽³⁴⁾ Cf. *In Ezechielem* 47,6-12, PL 25, 474C: «Aiunt autem qui de animalium scripsere naturis et proprietate, qui *halieytikā* tam Latino, quam Graeco didicere sermone, de quibus Oppianus Cilix est, poeta doctissimus, centum quinquaginta tria esse genera piscium quae omnia capta sunt ab apostolis, et nihil remansit incaptum, dum et nobiles et ignobiles, divites et pauperes, et omne genus hominum de mari hujus saeculi extrahitur ad salutem».

⁽³⁵⁾ Cf. la critica a Girolamo di GRANT, «One Hundred», 272-275.

⁽³⁶⁾ Cf. EMERTON, «The Hundred», 88.

5. «Prospaghion», «Ichthys» ed «opsarion»

L'ultimo elemento simbolico di Gv 21,1-14 è rappresentato dalla variazione lessicale con cui Gv denomina i pesci della rete (vv. 6.8.11) e della colazione (vv. 9.10.13). Generalmente insieme alle varianti *ichthys* ed *opsarion*, viene posto anche *prospaghion* di 21,5⁽³⁷⁾. In realtà il lessema non corrisponde a «pesce», bensì ad un generico «qualcosa da mangiare». Ne è prova il fatto che *prospaghion* è hapax neotestamentario e che non compare mai nella LXX. Non abbiamo paralleli per affermare che *prospaghion* sia una variante per designare il pesce allo stesso modo di *opsarion*. Per questo lasciamo questo termine nel suo significato generico di alimento. In realtà la prima variante per «pesce» è costituita da *opsarion* (vv. 9.10.13), che abbiamo già riscontrato in Gv 6,9.11. Per questo termine lasciamo il significato concreto di «pesce da mangiare», che Gesù stesso offre insieme al pane in Gv 21,13. La connessione sintattica tra Gv 21,13 e 6,11 fa pensare ad un riferimento «eucaristico» contenuto in *opsarion*⁽³⁸⁾:

6,11

*Elaben oun tous artous ho
Iēsous kai eucharistēsas
diedōken tois anakeimenois
homoiōs kai ek tōn opsariōn
hoson ēthelon.*

21,13

*erchetai Iēsous kai
lambanei ton arton
kai didōsin aytois
kai opsarion homoiōs.*

Il parallelismo sintattico tra 6,11 e 21,13 lascia intendere il riferimento eucaristico presente anche in 21,13.

Rimane tuttavia il fatto che mentre la simbologia eucaristica di *artos* sembra esplicita e fondamentale, quella di *opsarion* è secondaria ed implicita. In Gv Gesù non è designato come «vero pesce» allo stesso modo di «vero pane» (cf. Gv 6,32.35). Per questo in Gv 21,1-14, oltre ad *opsarion*, troviamo *ichthys* (vv. 6.8.11). Anche *ichthys* designa del pesce materiale, che però acquista nella narrazione di Gv una rilevanza soteriologica per quanti sono attirati nella rete. La connotazione simbolica di *ichthys*, che designa in Gv i salvati e non solo del pesce materiale, come *opsarion*, diventa chiara in Gv 21,10-11. In Gv 21,10 Gesù non sbaglia a dire: *Enegkate apo*

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. BROWN, *John*, II, 1071.

⁽³⁸⁾ Cf. BROWN, *John*, II, 1077, 1099-1100.

tōn opsariōn hōn epiasate nyn. Egli si riferisce al pesce materiale, concreto che hanno pescato. Ma Pietro in 21,11 *eilkysen to diktyon eis tēn gēn meston ichthyōn megalōn hekaton pentēkonta triōn*. La relazione con Ez 47,1-12 conferma la rilevanza soteriologica per quanti entrano a far parte della rete sino ad Eglayim. Pertanto riteniamo che *ichthys* in Gv non abbia tanto valore materiale di pesce, come *opsarion*, ma soprattutto senso soteriologico ed ecclesiologico per i redenti. La rilevanza soteriologica di *ichthys*, presente «in nuce» già nel materiale sinottico (cf. Mc 1,17; Lc 5,10) ora diventa chiara con tale variazione lessicale, propriamente giovannea.

Conclusione

Ancora una volta la simbologia giovannea si dimostra più profonda di quanto potessimo pensare, senza cadere in allegorismo che prescinda dai dati della narrazione. Tuttavia tale simbologia non si sviluppa soltanto a livello di «molteplici sensi» in base ai quali Gesù è il vero pane (Gv 6,22-65), la porta delle pecore (10,7), ma anche mediante significative variazioni lessicali. Già in Gv 4,6 al *pēgē* di cui parla Gesù si oppone il *phrear* (4,11) cui fa riferimento la Samaritana, per indicare la stessa realtà del pozzo. In Gv 21,15-17 avverrà qualcosa di analogo con la variante *arnia* (v.15) e *probata* (vv. 16.17), per riferirsi alla stessa realtà del gregge da pascere. Così in Gv 21,1-14 la variante lessicale di *opsarion* ed *ichthys* per designare la stessa realtà dei pesci è determinata forse più da motivazioni ecclesiologiche che di narrazioni composite. Altrimenti avremmo più un illogico e goffo racconto che una simbolica narratologia, rispondente alla modalità giovannea di fare teologia. Inoltre, dall'esegesi di Gv 21,1-14, ci sembra che i collegamenti tra Gv 1-20 e Gv 21 si dimostrino più rilevanti che se pensassimo a Gv 21 come di un autore successivo⁽³⁹⁾. La rete di collegamento tra le parti trova un suo fondamento nell'attualizzazione cristologica, pneumatologica ed ecclesiologica dell'oracolo di Ez 47,1-12. Questi non illumina soltanto il senso di Gv 7,37-39; 19,34 ma anche, in termini ecclesiologici, il simbolismo di una pesca prodigiosa, narrata in Gv 21,1-14.

Pontificio Seminario Lombardo
P.za S. Maria Maggiore, 5
00185 Roma

Antonio PITTA

⁽³⁹⁾ Così anche P.S. MINEAR, «The Original Function of John 21», *JBL* 102 (1983) 85-96.

SUMMARY

In John 21,1-14 the use of *ichthys* and *opsarion* is surprising since they both refer to fish. Only a symbolic reading of the pericope is able to see the value of the variation and the meaning of John 21,1-14. Ezek 47,1-12 constitutes the fundamental background of the passage: in the light of the oracle of the eschatological temple we see the meaning of the right side of the boat and the number one hundred and fifty-three for the fish, which corresponds by gematria to the spring of Eglayim. Thus, while *opsarion* designates simply the material fish, *ichthys* refers to the redeemed who enter into the unbroken net.

**“... gesprochen durch den Herrn” (Hebr 2,3).
Erwägungen zum Reden Gottes und Jesu im Hebräerbrieft**

Es kann in diesem kurzen Beitrag zur Diskussion um den in vielerlei Hinsicht noch immer rätselhaften Hebräerbrieft nicht um den Versuch einer geschlossenen Darstellung dessen gehen, wie sich der auctor ad Hebraeos das Reden Gottes vorstellt⁽¹⁾, wie er insbesondere im einzelnen das Verhältnis zwischen solchem Sprechen auf der einen, Person, Wort und Tat Jesu auf der anderen Seite bestimmt. Nicht einmal die technischere Frage, wie dabei das Alte Testament verwandt wird⁽²⁾, ist hier näher zu behandeln. Vielmehr soll lediglich eine einigermaßen kühne Aufstellung vorgetragen und begründet werden. Die zentrale These besagt, daß entgegen der als nahezu selbstverständlich geltenden üblichen Auslegung die Wendung διὰ τοῦ κυρίου in 2,3 nicht auf Jesus, sondern auf Gott selbst zu beziehen ist⁽³⁾. Der Paradigmenwechsel ist deshalb zur Diskussion zu stellen, weil er Schwierigkeiten der herkömmlichen Interpretation (I.1) zu lösen verspricht (I.2), auch nicht durch (nur) dem Anschein nach entgegenstehende Indizien falsifiziert werden dürfte (II), ferner die Einbettung in den engeren (III.1-2) und weiteren Kontext (III.3) besser zu erfassen erlauben wird.

⁽¹⁾ Dazu zuletzt M. RISSI, *Die Theologie des Hebräerbrieft* (WUNT 41; Tübingen 1987) 29f.

⁽²⁾ Vgl. dazu die Überblicke bei E. GRÄBER, “Der Hebräerbrieft 1938-1963”, *TRu* 30 (1964) 138-236, 204-214, O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (MeyerK XIII¹³; Göttingen 1975) 151-158, und H. BRAUN, *An die Hebräer* (HNT 14; Tübingen 1984) 20f, ferner G. HUGHES, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics* (SNTSMS 36; Cambridge 1979) bes. 47-66.

⁽³⁾ Daß J. Ch. K. v. HOFMANN, *Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht* (Nördlingen 1873) 100 samt Anm. 2, eine solche Auffassung F. DELITZSCH (vgl. u. Anm. 34) fälschlich zuschreibt, hat schon F. ZIMMER, “Hebr. 2,1-5”, *TSK* 55 (1882) 413-470, 451 Anm. **, hervorgehoben, der seinerseits statt dessen (ebd., 451 Anm.) vorsichtig (“vielleicht”) J. H. A. EBRARD, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Biblischer Kommentar über sämtliche Schriften des Neuen Testaments 5,2; Königsberg 1850) 72f, namhaft machen zu können meint, freilich ebenfalls zu Unrecht

I. Vorzüge des Paradigmenwechsels

1. Beim Paradigma "Reden Jesu": Schwierigkeiten

Daß in der Sekundärliteratur keine Einigkeit darüber besteht, ob in 2,3 an den irdischen oder an den erhöhten Herrn gedacht ist⁽⁴⁾, gehört noch nicht zu dem, was gegenüber der Auslegungstradition skeptisch macht, spiegelt es doch ein Problem wider, mit dem die Exegese des Hebräerbriefts auch jenseits unserer Stelle zu tun hat⁽⁵⁾. Aber schon wenn man auf den Erhöhten deutet, erst recht bei der häufigeren⁽⁶⁾ Interpretation auf den Irdischen hin, verwundert angesichts des sonstigen Schreibens der Akzent, der in 2,1-4 durch die überbietende Gegenüberstellung zu ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος auf der Wortmitteilung seitens des κύριος liegt. Jesu Sprechen wird nämlich im übrigen Hebräerbrieft nicht eben oft erwähnt (1,2,3⁽⁷⁾; 2,11ff; 10,5ff; vgl. 5,7)⁽⁸⁾, und ein Wort des Irdischen

(s. ebd., 73, wo E. von "der von Christo verkündigten σωτηρία" spricht). Soweit ich sehe, kommt bislang nur F.C. SYNGE, *Hebrews and the Scriptures* (London 1959) 47, der zu begründenden These sehr nahe, sofern sich nach ihm die Wendung ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου auf "the prefiguration of salvation spoken in the Old Testament" und "through the Lord Jehova" bezieht. Allerdings sagt er in diesem Zusammenhang (ebd.) allein von den Adressaten des Schreibens — nicht (auch) von Gestalten der alttestamentlichen Zeit —: "They have heard the Gospel, and it has been confirmed among them by signs and wonders and visible evidence of the Holy Spirit's presence." Vgl. ferner F.F. BRUCE, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (NLC 14; London-Edinburgh 1964) 29.

⁽⁴⁾ Vgl. dazu nur E. GRÄBER, "Das Heil als Wort. Exegetische Erwägungen zu Hebr 2,1-4", *Neues Testament und Geschichte* (FS O. Cullmann; [ed. H. BALTENSWILER – B. REICKE] Zürich 1972) 261-274, 263-265.

⁽⁵⁾ Vgl. zu diesem Problemkreis etwa BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 32f.

⁽⁶⁾ GRÄBER, "Heil", 264, spricht von einem "breiten Konsensus".

⁽⁷⁾ In diesen beiden Versen liegt der eigentliche Ton offenbar nicht auf dem Sprechen Jesu, wie schon daraus erhellt (vgl. zudem 11,3), daß am Eingang der Periode zweimal Gott als der Redende erscheint (1,1f).

⁽⁸⁾ Dagegen, hier auch noch 6,1 mit der bekannten die "Anfangslehre Christi" apostrophierenden Wendung zu nennen, spricht unter anderem der dortige katechismusartige Zusammenhang, der die meisten Ausleger (vgl. nur BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 157f) schließen läßt: τοῦ Χριστοῦ "meint wahrscheinlich Predigt über Jesus, Genitivus objektivus" (ebd., 157; anders bes. A. SEEBERG, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* [Leipzig 1903] 248f, der indes schon bei

schen, wie wir es aus der Evangelienüberlieferung kennen, findet sich nicht; vielmehr läßt der Verfasser Jesus in 2,11ff und auch in 10,5ff ausschließlich alttestamentliche Formulierungen verwenden. Zwar könnten in 2,12f gut Bezüge zur recht direkt auf den historischen Jesus (und den Auferstandenen) zurückgehenden Tradition intendiert sein⁽⁹⁾, zwar auch wird das wahrscheinlich sogar inhaltlich umrissene⁽¹⁰⁾ flehentliche Bitten von 5,7 ausdrücklich “in den Tagen seines Fleisches” festgemacht. Aber die Belege bleiben spärlich, und wie in 5,7 ist überdies auch sonst nirgends so etwas wie ein Auditorium Jesu angedeutet, während eben ein solches bei der gängigen Auslegung von 2,3 mit den ἀκούσαντες gegeben ist. Berührt so im Rahmen des Hebräerbriefts der vermeintliche Akzent auf dem Reden Jesu schon merkwürdig genug⁽¹¹⁾, so kommen bei der herkömmlichen Deutung andere Seltsamkeiten hinzu:

(1) Während ὁ κύριος hier Zusatzlos gebraucht ist, tritt — sieht man von dem unmittelbar durch den zitierten Passus aus Ps 101(102),26(-28) vorgegebenen und in (Hebr) 1,10 (s. V.8) auf den “Sohn” bezogenen Vokativ κύριε ab⁽¹²⁾ — dort, wo (sonst) in diesem Schreiben Jesus als Herr bezeichnet wird, zumindest ein Personalpronomen hinzu: Es ist da von “unserem Herrn” (7,14) bzw. “unserem Herrn Jesus” (13,20) die Rede. An allen übrigen Stellen, und zwar sehr wahrscheinlich mit Einschluß von 12,14⁽¹³⁾, meint (ὁ)

den Katechismus-Daten von 6,1, Buße und Glaube, einlenken muß: “Die Behauptung, daß die beiden Stücke als Bestandteile des Wortes Christi gemeint sein müßten, ist wenigstens in dieser Form unberechtigt”); eine andere Interpretation dürfte höchstens dann möglich sein, wenn 2,3 — entgegen unserer These — dafür als Parallele (vgl. BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 158) reklamiert werden könnte (vgl. u. Anm. 132). Auch 1,7b.c wird man — schon wegen 1,5f — nicht gut zu den Jesus-Worten zählen können (gegen O. HOFIUS, *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11* [WUNT 17; Tübingen 1976] 90).

⁽⁹⁾ Vgl. dazu nur MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 158 (Mt 12,49; 25,40; 28,10; Joh 20,17; Röm 8,29). Was (Hebr) 10,5ff angeht, vgl. HUGHES, *Hermeneutics*, 62.

⁽¹⁰⁾ S. dazu M. BACHMANN, “Hohepriesterliches Leiden. Beobachtungen zu Hebr 5,1-10”, *ZNW* 78 (1987) 244-266, bes. 246.264.

⁽¹¹⁾ Vgl. dazu u. Anm. 35 (MOFFATT; RISSI).

⁽¹²⁾ Vgl. dazu u. Anm. 105.

⁽¹³⁾ Dafür spricht einerseits, daß als Hintergrund der religionsgeschichtlich bedeutsame Topos vom Schauen Gottes anzunehmen sein wird (s. dazu nur BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 382f, 424), andererseits die den Hebräerbrieff bestimmende Vorstellung vom Eintritt in das himmlische Allerheiligste (s. bes. 6,20; 7,19; 10,19f) und damit vom Zugang zu Gott (vgl. dazu bes.

κύριος, nun jeweils ohne eine solche Näherbestimmung verwandt, Gott selbst (7,21; 8,2.8.9.10.11; 10,16.30; 12,5.6; 13,6). Sollte 2,3 dieses deutliche Bild trüben⁽¹⁴⁾?

(2) Kann man sich angesichts dessen, daß eine Beteiligung von Engeln bei der Sinaigesetzgebung im jüdischen und gerade auch im frühchristlichen Bereich (neben 2,2: Apg 7,38.53; Gal 3,19) belegte Anschauung ist⁽¹⁵⁾, unter dem "durch Engel gesprochenen Wort" (2,2) leicht etwas vorstellen und findet solche Auffassung an weiteren Stellen des Hebräerbriefts trotz anderer Terminologie gewisse Bestätigungen (bes. 9,19; 10,28; 12,18ff), so ist das beim Reden von 2,3, wenn man hier Jesus als den Sprechenden vermutet, nicht so einfach⁽¹⁶⁾. Denn Jesu Wort spielt, wie wir sahen, in diesem Schreiben gerade keine sonderlich betonte Rolle, und jedenfalls ist dabei ein die Belege inhaltlich zusammenhaltender Einheitspunkt kaum auszumachen, dem man die das Heil und seinen Anfang betreffenden Andeutungen unseres Verses zuordnen könnte⁽¹⁷⁾.

(3) Speziell mit dem näheren rückwärtigen Kontext verträgt sich alles andere als gut, daß bei Interpretation des κύριος auf Jesus hin wegen der Differenz zwischen den ἀκούσαντες und den ἡμεῖς gelten müßte: in "2,3 ... wird die historische Distanz zum Auftreten Jesu gerade bedacht"⁽¹⁸⁾. Denn auf der anderen Seite ist das in 1,2,

O. HOFIUS, *Katapausis* [WUNT 11; Tübingen 1970], bes. 54, 94, 96, 151, und DERS., *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes* [WUNT 14; Tübingen 1972], bes. 73 samt Anm. 137). Anders (als "die meisten" Exegeten [BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 424]) z.B. F. HAHN, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (FRLANT 83; Göttingen 1963) 94, Anm. 2, und GRÄBER, "Heil", 264.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Registriert ist die Schwierigkeit z.B. bei ZIMMER, "Hebr. 2,1-5", 452, Anm. samt Anm. *, und bei E. RIGGENBACH, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KNT XIV; Leipzig 1913) 30, der das Fehlen des Personalpronomens wie folgt zu erklären versucht: "Jesus wird damit als der Herr bezeichnet, der das nicht nur für seine Gemeinde ist, dem vielmehr alle irdischen (1,1) und überirdischen (2,2) Gottesboten schlechthin untergeordnet sind". Ganz anders die Auskunft von HAHN, *Hoheitstitel*, 94f: Nachwirken "einer profanen Anrede" Jesu.

⁽¹⁵⁾ S. dazu nur BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 48.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Vgl. A. SEEBERG, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Leipzig 1912) 17.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Vgl. GRÄBER, "Heil", 265, Anm. 23: "Auffallend ist ... ja zweifellos auch, daß die Frage, was denn Jesus als ἀρχή des Heils verkündigt hat, vom Autor ad Hebraeos gar nicht gestellt wird". (Wenn G. freilich fortfährt, die Frage werde "in 2,12 mit Ps 22,27 beantwortet", so fehlt für diese Kombination doch ein einigermaßen zwingender Grund.

⁽¹⁸⁾ GRÄBER, "Heil", 262. Doch vgl. RISSI, *Theologie*, 3f.

wo bei dem Wir, das die Adressaten des Redens Gottes “im Sohn” bezeichnet, zumindest nicht ausdrücklich von den “Ohrenzeugen” abgesehen wird, eben nicht der Fall⁽¹⁹⁾.

(4) Wer die ἀκούσαντες (von 2,3) als Hörer Jesu begreift, kann den Ausdruck τὰ ἀκουσθέντα in 2,1 von daher verstehen⁽²⁰⁾ und muß sich dann fragen lassen, wie hier mit διὰ τοῦτο an das unmittelbar Vorangehende angeknüpft werden kann, obwohl solch ein Hören jedenfalls nicht in 1,5-14, sondern allenfalls in 1,2a.3b mitzudenken ist. Wer — darum — “das Gehörte” lieber von den (weiterhin) im Sinne der “Ohrenzeugen” Jesu verstandenen Hörern trennt⁽²¹⁾, dürfte den Aufbau von 2,1-4 gegen sich haben, sofern der Text an beiden Stellen (2,1 und 2,3c) die ἡμεῖς an das, was zu hören war, bindet⁽²²⁾.

(5) Nachdem in 1,4-14 mehrfach die Engel und Jesus voneinander abgehoben wurden, wäre gegen eine Fortsetzung dieses Nebeneinanders in 2,1-4 an sich nichts einzuwenden. Aber daß dabei nun auf einmal Gottes Reden, das von 1,1f an leitend ist und nach 1,(4.)5-14 sowie 2,5-9 gerade auch das Verhältnis zwischen jenen und Jesus festlegt, nahezu keine Rolle (mehr) spielen, vielmehr mit dem (vielleicht Engel und Kyrios als so etwas wie göttliche Instrumente kennzeichnenden) διὰ von 2,2.3⁽²³⁾ höchstens anklingen soll, stimmt nachdenklich.

(6) Fast notwendig⁽²⁴⁾ kommt der Ausleger, der von der Identifizierung des κύριος von 2,3 mit Jesus ausgeht, dazu, die Aufeinanderfolge von Kyrios, Hörern und ἡμεῖς im Sinne frühchristlicher Traditionserwägungen zu verstehen und entsprechend βεβαιοῦσθαι auf die Verlässlichkeit der (irgendwie Jesus betreffenden) Überlieferung zu beziehen⁽²⁵⁾. Das ist aber wohl schon deshalb heikel, weil

⁽¹⁹⁾ Vgl. nur GRÄBER, “Heil”, 262.

⁽²⁰⁾ So etwa BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 47.

⁽²¹⁾ So etwa A. STROBEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (NTD 9¹¹, 79-256; Göttingen 1975) 95(-97).

⁽²²⁾ S. dazu A. VANHOYE, *La Structure Littéraire de l'Épître aux Hébreux* (SN 1; Paris etc. 1963) 76, ferner u. III.1.

⁽²³⁾ Vgl. z.B. BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 49; vgl. ferner u. Anm. 41.

⁽²⁴⁾ Besonders beachtliche Ausnahmen stellen die Erwägungen von B. WEIß, *Handbuch über den Brief an die Hebräer* (MeyerK XIII⁵; Göttingen 1888) 60-62, und H. SCHLIER, “βέβαιος κτλ.”, *TWNT* I, 600-603, 602f, dar.

⁽²⁵⁾ Vgl. bes. RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 30f (bes. Anm. 84: Annahme einer Brachylogie in 2,3c), und GRÄBER, “Heil”, 261, 267f.

dann "stillschweigend Zwischenglieder anzunehmen"⁽²⁶⁾ wären. Vor allem indes ist es wegen der ins Auge fallenden Korrespondenz zwischen dem ἐβεβαιώθη und der (ebenfalls den Aorist verwendenden) Formulierung ἐγένετο βέβαιος in 2,2⁽²⁷⁾ schwierig, sofern es bei ihr nicht um einen qualitativ beachtlichen Prozeß der Weitergabe geht, sondern um den durch die Bestrafung der Übertretung jeweils gegebenen Akt, der die Gültigkeit, die "Rechtsgültigkeit"⁽²⁸⁾ des λόγος "erwies"⁽²⁹⁾. Näher läge es, von hier aus auch das ἐβεβαιώθη zu begreifen⁽³⁰⁾.

(7) Auch "die alte Streitfrage"⁽³¹⁾, ob das Reden des κύριος schon Anfang des Heils sei oder den Beginn des Sprechens von der σωτηρία markiere⁽³²⁾, dürfte Funktion der Interpretation auf Jesus als den Herrn hin sein. Denn gegen die durch den Wortlaut nahegelegte erste Möglichkeit⁽³³⁾ und für die Vermutung, es handle sich hier um eine Brachylogie⁽³⁴⁾, scheinen letztlich vor allem christologi-

⁽²⁶⁾ Ebd., 267.

⁽²⁷⁾ S. dazu nochmals VANHOYE, *Structure*, 76, und u. III.1.

⁽²⁸⁾ BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 48.

⁽²⁹⁾ So gibt BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 48, das ἐγένετο wieder.

⁽³⁰⁾ So mit Recht SCHLIER, "βέβαιος", (602-)603.

⁽³¹⁾ GRÄBER, "Heil", 266.

⁽³²⁾ Vgl. zu dieser Alternative bes. H. WINDISCH, *Der Hebräerbrief* (HNT 14; Tübingen 1931) 19, und BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 49 (Literatur).

⁽³³⁾ Dabei ist kaum darum herumzukommen, daß "διὰ wegen der Parallele v. 2 nur mit λαλεῖσθαι verbunden werden kann" (RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 30, Anm. 83), nicht hingegen direkt mit ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα (gegen WEIB, *Hebräer*, 61). Wenn der Relativsatz zunächst in 2,3b vom Anfang des Heils, wie er mit dem Reden des Herrn gesetzt ist, handelt, schließt sich 2,3c ohne weiteres an, sofern das Partizip auf eben jenes zuletzt erwähnte Sprechen, die finite Verbform auf die (schon "angefangene") σωτηρία zurückgreift (mit ZIMMER, "Hebr. 2,1-5", bes. 448, 455).

⁽³⁴⁾ So schon F. DELITZSCH, *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer* (Leipzig 1857 [= Gießen 1989]) 51: "kurzer Ausdruck für ...: nachdem es (sc. das Heil) den Anfang seiner Verkündigung damit genommen, dass es verkündigt ward durch den Herrn". Entsprechend z.B. RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 30, Anm. 83 (vgl. o. Anm. 25!).

⁽³⁵⁾ Vgl. z.B. ZIMMER, "Hebr. 2,1-5", 443, Anm. 2, WINDISCH, *Hebräer*, 19, und MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 129, ferner J. MOFFATT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (ICC; Edinburgh 1924) 19, und H. STRATHMANN, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (NTD 9, 69-158; Göttingen 1963) 82. MOFFATT, *Hebrews*, 19, läßt im übrigen (wie nun RISSI, *Theologie*, 3) das Reden "personality and career" Jesu mitumfassen und sucht so das scheinbar Anstößige der Formulierung aufzuheben.

sche Bedenken zu sprechen: Fehlen des Werkes Christi/des Wortes über ihn⁽³⁵⁾ bzw. Gefährdung des solus Christus⁽³⁶⁾.

2. Beim Paradigma “Reden Gottes”: Wegfall der Schwierigkeiten

Die Zahl der ins Blickfeld getretenen Schwierigkeiten, die mit der üblichen Interpretation von 2,3bβ im Zusammenhang des Hebräerbriefs verbunden scheinen, ist beachtlich. Statt nach weiteren derartigen Problemen Ausschau zu halten (doch vgl. u. II), dürfte sich der Test empfehlen, ob die schon registrierten sich dann vermindern oder abschwächen, wenn man an unserer Stelle κύριος als Bezeichnung Gottes versteht. Nun — sie fallen sämtlich weg.

Das gilt zunächst für die grundsätzliche inhaltliche Frage nach dem Akzent auf der Wortmitteilung; denn das Reden Gottes selbst spielt bekanntlich vom ersten bis zum letzten Kapitel des Briefs eine wichtige Rolle (s. nur 1,1; 13,7).

Gleichmaßen erübrigen sich dann die spezielleren Bedenken:

(1) Ohne (weiteren) Zusatz meint ja, wie schon deutlich wurde, im Hebräerbrief (ὁ) κύριος in aller Regel Gott.

(2) Wenn dabei zumeist — außer in 8,2 und 12,14: stets — direkt auf das Alte Testament Bezug genommen wird, kann damit auch anschaulich werden, was denn Inhalt solchen Sprechens sein mag. Es fügt sich nämlich zur σωτηρία, genauer: zu ihrem Anfang im Reden Gottes, zum einen, daß das erste derartige Vorkommen von κύριος nach 2,3 mit einem Zitat aus dem für den auctor ad Hebraeos ungemein wichtigen Ps 109(110)⁽³⁷⁾, ja aus dem auf Jesu hohepriesterliches Amt gedeuteten Vers Ps 109(110),4 gegeben ist (7,21⁽³⁸⁾). Zum anderen paßt dazu, daß nicht weniger als fünf der auf Gott gehenden κύριος-Belege im Rahmen von Zitationen aus Jer 38(31),31-34 begegnen⁽³⁹⁾ (8,8.9.10.11; 10,16). In erster Annäherung darf man deshalb das Reden Gottes von 2,3 mit seinem in

⁽³⁶⁾ Vgl. RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 30, Anm. 83.

⁽³⁷⁾ Vgl. dazu etwa J.P. MEIER, “Structure and Theology in Heb 1,1-14”, *Bib* 66 (1985) 168-189, 184, Anm. 55.

⁽³⁸⁾ In der Reihe der Stellen, die (recht) direkt auf Ps 109(110),4 Bezug nehmen (5,6.10; 6,20; 7,3.11.15.17.21), ist 7,21 nicht nur die letzte, sondern inhaltlich wie formal dadurch hervorgehoben, daß erst hier hinsichtlich des ewigen Priestertums der Eidschwur des Kyrios mitzitiert wird.

⁽³⁹⁾ Ansonsten wird κύριος in 10,30 aus Ps 134(135),14, in 12,5f aus Spr 3,11f und schließlich in 13,6 aus Ps 117(118),6 aufgenommen.

alttestamentlichen Texten dokumentierten Sprechen verbinden, sofern es das Eschaton betrifft.

(3) Ist in 2,3b solchermaßen Gottes Reden im Blick, so ist bei den ἀκούσαντες von 2,3c an Personen der alttestamentlichen Periode gedacht⁽⁴⁰⁾. Es kann unter dieser Voraussetzung in 2,3c natürlich ebensowenig wie in 1,2 um eine Reflexion des historischen Abstands zwischen Jesus und der Gemeinde (zur Zeit) des Hebräerbriefs gehen.

(4) Haben die ἀκούσαντες es mit dem Reden Gottes in vorchristlicher Zeit zu tun, das irgendwie auf die ἡμεῖς zielt (2,3c), so hat das damals Gehörte insbesondere für die letzteren Relevanz; 2,1a mit dem Ausdruck τὰ ἀκουσθέντα fügt sich also, gerade auch was die ἡμεῖς betrifft, erstens problemlos zu 2,3c, und zweitens ist der rückwärtige Anschluß ebenfalls gut, sofern in 1,5-14 eine Kette alttestamentlicher Zitate — als letztes Glied, in V. 13, Ps 109(110),! — vorliegt, bei denen Gott als der (im Blick auf das Eschaton) Sprechende vorgestellt ist.

(5) Es spannt sich demnach, wenn das λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου auf das Reden Gottes selbst geht⁽⁴¹⁾, der Bogen mühelos von 1,1f und 1,4-14 hinüber zu 2,1.3, überdies indes noch weiter, da schon in 2,6-8 wieder ein alttestamentliches Zitat⁽⁴²⁾ folgt.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Eine frappante Bestätigung bieten die jenseits von 2,1-4 begegnenden Belege des Hebräerbriefs für das Partizip, also 3,16; 4,2 und 12,19. Zu ihnen fügt sich, daß das Verb ἀκούειν im Hebräerbrief dort ausschließlich im Zusammenhang der Sinai-Geschehnisse (12,19) und des pneumatischen (s. 3,7) Wortes Ps 94(95),7ff vorkommt (3,7.15.16; 4,2.7).

⁽⁴¹⁾ Dabei kann das διὰ mit nachfolgendem Genitiv, das vielleicht der Parallelität mit 2,2a halber gesetzt ist (vgl. RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 30, Anm. 82), natürlich nicht den κύριος als göttliches Instrument kennzeichnen sollen (vgl. [dazu] o. [bei] Anm. 23); vielmehr dürfte es hier unter Verwendung der Präposition — ähnlich wie in 2,10 (s. dazu W. BAUER, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* [ed. K. ALAND – B. ALAND] [Berlin 1988] 361: “v. Urheber”, und zwar “v. Gott”; ZIMMER, “Hebr. 2,1-5”, 434, Anm. 1, umgeht diese Vergleichsstelle leider) und auch in 7,21 — um Gott, den Kyrios, als Urheber gehen. Bei 2,2a könnte man ähnlich verstehen, ohne daß die andere Nuance, Gott stehe hinter den Engeln, ausgeschlossen sein müßte. Vgl. u. (bei) Anm. 119.

⁽⁴²⁾ Gerade dies, daß die seltsame Zitateinführung Indifferenz des auctor ad Hebraeos gegenüber der historischen Konstellation verrät, welcher die zitierte Passage zugehört (vgl. 4,4), ist Indiz für seine auch hier leitende Überzeugung: “die Gottheit... redet selber” (BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 53; vgl. ebd., 20f). Vgl. u. bei Anm. 87.

(6) Handelt es sich bei den ἀκούσαντες nicht um “Ohrenzeugen” Jesu, sondern Gottes, um Personen aus früherer Zeit, so kann für 2,3b.c bzw. 2,3c deshalb nicht gut die Vorstellung von einem intakten Traditionsprozeß angenommen werden, weil es im frühchristlichen Bereich an Parallelen für eine solche positive Linie — etwa zurück zum Hörerkreis Jeremias — fehlt. Dann steht einer Auffassung von 2,3c, die das ἐβεβαιώθη gemäß dem ἐγένετο βέβαιος von 2,2 faßt, schwerlich noch etwas entgegen: Die σωτηρία wurde von den Hörern εἰς ἡμᾶς, in bezug auf uns⁽⁴³⁾, “rechtlich gültig gemacht”⁽⁴⁴⁾.

(7) Hat man unter dem κύριος Gott selbst zu verstehen, so fällt endlich jede Versuchung hin, den Wortlaut von 2,3b im Sinne einer Brachylogie zu nehmen; denn daß Gottes Wort Wirklichkeit setzt —

⁽⁴³⁾ Darauf, hier bei εἰς ἡμᾶς nicht nur allgemein die Richtung auf eine Gruppe von Personen hin angesprochen zu finden, sondern (anders als F. LAUB, *Hebräerbrief* [Stuttgarter Kleiner Kommentar. Neues Testament 14; Stuttgart 1988] 32, es will) genauer den exklusiven und intendierten Bezug auf eben diesen Kreis (vgl. zur Möglichkeit solcher Nuance BAUER, *Wörterbuch*, 346), weist erstens die einzige Parallele des Hebräerbriefs für die Verbindung der Präpositionen ὑπό und εἰς, also 12,3. Zweitens sind die ἡμεῖς nicht nur offenkundig im Passus 2,1-4 (s. 2,1a.3a.c; vgl. u. III.1 sowie ZIMMER, “Hebr. 2,1-5”, bes. 445, 455), sondern ähnlich z.B. auch in 10,15 und 11,(39-)40 (vgl. 4,2f; 12,1; vgl. ZIMMER, ebd., 445) deutlich hervorgehoben (vgl. ferner das εἰς ἡμᾶς bzw. ὑμᾶς von Röm 5,8; 8,18 bzw. von 1 Petr 1,4.10.25 [vgl. dazu 1 Petr 1,11]; Apg 2,22; 1 Thess 1,5; vgl. überdies Apg 2,25; Röm 16,26). Endlich ist, was εἰς angeht, auch 7,14 zu vergleichen. Vgl. ferner die u. bei Anm. 80 aufgeführten Sachparallelen.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ So SCHLIER, “βέβαιος”, 603, (bei dem diese Wörter kursiv gesetzt sind und) der selbst indes die Hörer mit den Aposteln identifiziert, gleichwohl aber die Rechtsterminologie von 2,2a.3c.4 klar herausarbeitet. Da er unter den insgesamt sieben (oder acht) Belegen des Hebräerbriefs für βέβαιος, βεβαιοῦν und βεβαίωσις außer 2,2.3 auch 6,16 ausdrücklich der juristischen Sphäre zuweist (ebd.) und da ihr fraglos auch die διαθήκη-Stelle 9,17 zuzurechnen ist (s. A. FUCHS, “βέβαιος κτλ.”, *EWNT* I, 504-506, 506), wird man hier wohl schon deshalb von einem Schwerpunkt in der Verwendung der Wortfamilie sprechen dürfen. Beachtet man zudem, daß 6,19 von 6,16 und der juristischen Begrifflichkeit von 6,16-18 nicht zu trennen ist und daß 13,9 erst aufgrund der kultisch-rechtlichen Ausführungen der nachfolgenden Verse (s. bes. ἔξουσία in V. 10 und dazu BAUER, *Wörterbuch*, 562) verständlich wird (vgl. nur BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 463), so bleibt nur noch die Wendung vom “Festhalten bis ans Ende” (3,6 v.l.; 3,14) übrig (BRAUN, ebd., 97: “hier... nicht ‘rechtsgültig’”; doch vgl. G. A. DEISSMANN, *Bibelstudien* [Marburg 1895] 102f, bes. 103, Anm. 2).

und darum auch den Anfang des Heils setzen kann —, ist wie dem Alten Testament⁽⁴⁵⁾ auch dem Hebräerbrieft (s. bes. 4,12; 6,5; 11,3) vertraute Vorstellung.

II. Vorzüge des älteren Paradigmas?

Die jesuanische Auslegung des κύριος von 2,3 reüssierte natürlich nicht aufgrund eines trotzigen Dennoch zu den mit ihr verbundenen Schwierigkeiten. Es ist darum zu fragen, welche Textmerkmale zu ihr vor allem Anlaß gegeben haben mögen. Detaillierte Begründungen für die herkömmliche Sicht sind nun freilich in der Literatur nicht eben leicht auszumachen, wahrscheinlich deshalb, weil bei einer als selbstverständlich geltenden Auffassung ausdrückliche Bemühungen, sie zu rechtfertigen, unterbleiben können. Immerhin ist soviel deutlich, daß der Vers 2,3 mit dem nachfolgenden zusammen nach Analogie ähnlicher neutestamentlicher Formulierungen begriffen wird. Wenn es im Blick auf die Wunderterminologie von 2,4 beispielsweise einmal heißt: es "bildet... Mk 16,20 den gegebenen Ausgangspunkt für die Interpretation"⁽⁴⁶⁾ und wenn diese Stelle auch unmittelbar für die Auslegung von 2,3 reklamiert wird⁽⁴⁷⁾, so ist das aufschlußreich sowohl dafür, daß ein diachron bestimmtes Verstehensmodell in Ansatz gebracht zu werden pflegt⁽⁴⁸⁾, als auch für den in Anspruch genommenen Bereich von "Parallelen", der es — wie die genannte "nächste Parallele"⁽⁴⁹⁾ — mit der irgendwie durch Wunder (1) erfolgenden Bestätigung der (jesuanischen oder urchristlichen) Verkündigung (2) zu tun hat.

Wir haben deshalb in der gebotenen Kürze zu prüfen, wie eng 2,3f in diesen beiden Hinsichten mit ein wenig näher zu bestimmenden Formulierungen und Traditionen außerhalb des Hebräerbrieft verbunden ist, und dann jeweils im Zusammenhang dieser Schrift, also synchron, nach von ihr aus möglichen Deutungen zu fragen.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ S. z.B. Gen 1,3 und Jes 55,11. Genauerer bei G. V. RAD, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Bd. I (München 1969) 156f; DERS., *dass.*, Bd. II (München 1968) 89-107. Vgl. HOFIUS, *Katapausis*, Anm. 881 (zu 142).

⁽⁴⁶⁾ K. H. RENGSTORF, "σημεῖον κτλ.", *TWNT* VII, 199-268, 260. Wiewohl Mk 16,20 hier derart betont ist, wird freilich explizit gesagt, daß "Ex 4,1 ff den biblischen Hintergrund" abgebe.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ So z.B. bei MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 130.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Vgl. die Kommentare z.St. (d.h. zu 2,3f).

⁽⁴⁹⁾ MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 130 (vgl. ebd. Anm. 4).

1. Wunderterminologie

Was die Wunderterminologie von 2,4 angeht, so erinnert der hier begegnende vierteilige Ausdruck, in dem σημεῖα und τέρατα einerseits⁽⁵⁰⁾, ποικίλαι δυνάμεις und πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοί andererseits⁽⁵¹⁾ besonders eng zusammengehören werden, in der Tat an ähnliche Zusammenstellungen, die sich auf das Wirken Jesu oder, häufiger, auf Vorkommnisse im Raum der frühen Gemeinde beziehen. Eine genaue Entsprechung zum Nebeneinander der vier Begriffe findet sich freilich nicht; denn in Röm 15,19 ist der Ausdruck “Zeichen und Wunder” Teil einer Wendung, die durch das singulärste ἐν δυνάμει eingeleitet wird — das dann erneut der Nennung des Geistes (Gottes) voransteht —, und bei der vergleichbaren Stelle Apg 6,8 erscheint δύναμις ebenfalls (nur) im Singular, das vierte, das pneumatische Element überdies lediglich im Kontext (V.3.5.10). Sind für die Viereraufreihung von (Hebr) 2,4 die Parallelen also nicht sonderlich frappant, so hat man doch wenigstens für die drei ersten Begriffe die These aufzustellen gewagt: es “gab... die Trias ‘Zeichen, Wunder und Kräfte’ als feste Formel in einer bereits traditionellen Anschauung des Urchristentums, der sich unser Vf hier anschließt”⁽⁵²⁾. Weil der auctor ad Hebraeos dabei den abhängigen Part vertreten soll und die Trias durch das Adjektiv ποικίλος sowie ein viertes Glied ergänzt haben müßte, bleiben jedoch als Belege nur 2 Kor 12,12 und Apg 2,22⁽⁵³⁾. Dabei berührt sich zwar der paulinische Vers zumindest insofern deutlich mit (Hebr) 2,4, als hier wie dort die ersten beiden Begriffe durch τὰ καὶ verbunden sind und die “Kräfte” an dritter Stelle erscheinen. Aber daß dem in Apg 2,22, wo insbesondere die “Kräfte” voranstehen, nicht so ist, daß es an dieser Stelle zudem anders als in 2 Kor 12,12 um Wunderhaftes bei Jesus selbst geht, läßt die zitierte These als äußerst fraglich erscheinen. Die verzeichneten Beobachtungen und das Faktum des Bezuges einer jener Trias immerhin nahestehenden Aufreihung in 2 Thess 2,9

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Dafür spricht die (freilich in einigen Handschriften fehlende) Partikel τέ, die nur vor dem καὶ zwischen diesen beiden Substantiven der Aufreihung gesetzt ist (vgl. ebd., 130).

⁽⁵¹⁾ RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 31, Anm. 86, führt hierfür mit Recht den “Rhythmus des Satzes” an (vgl. WEIB, *Hebräer*, 63).

⁽⁵²⁾ GRÄBER, “Heil”, 268.

⁽⁵³⁾ GRÄBER, ebd., führt, seine These zu “beweisen” (ebd.), außerdem noch Röm 15,19; Gal 3,5 und 2 Thess 2,9 an.

auf satanische Wirksamkeit führen vielmehr zu der Annahme, daß allein der Ausdruck "Zeichen und Wunder" im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch einigermaßen fest ist, ohne freilich eindeutig auf den Bereich mehr oder weniger apostolischer Wunder zu verweisen. Beides ist an den bislang noch nicht erwähnten neutestamentlichen Belegen für "Zeichen und Wunder"⁽⁵⁴⁾ ablesbar, bei denen es um frühchristliche Wunder (Apg 2,43; 4,30; 5,12; 14,3; 15,12), ferner aber auch um vermutete Zeichenforderung im Umfeld Jesu (Joh 4,48), um so etwas wie Signale der Endzeit (Mk 13,22 [vgl. Mt 24,24]; vgl. Apg 2,19), schließlich um Taten während des Exodusgeschehens (Apg 7,36) geht.

Sowohl die bemerkenswerte Festigkeit des Ausdrucks "Zeichen und Wunder" als auch die soeben notierte Varianz in seiner Anwendung weisen auf den hier fraglos durchschlagenden alttestamentlichen Hintergrund der Formulierung⁽⁵⁵⁾ hin. Sie begegnet ja bekanntlich im Alten Testament recht häufig, und zwar ist das dort gerade primär im Zusammenhang mit dem Auszug aus Ägypten, unter Einschluß der Wüstenwanderung⁽⁵⁶⁾ (vgl. Apg 7,36), und mit prophetischem Wirken⁽⁵⁷⁾ (vgl. Mk 13,22) der Fall, wobei "Zeichen und Wunder" die Aufgabe der Legitimation haben⁽⁵⁸⁾ (vgl. Joh 4,48). Dieser Hintergrund ist aber nicht nur bei jener zweigliedrigen Formel deutlich⁽⁵⁹⁾, sondern zumindest gelegentlich auch dort noch recht direkt erkennbar, wo sie mit dem — nicht zuletzt (aus) der synoptischen Tradition vertrauten (s. z.B. Mk 6,2) — Begriff δύνανται

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Synonym kann es in der Apostelgeschichte "Wunder und Zeichen" heißen (2,22.43; 6,8; 7,36; vgl. 2,19). Vgl. RENGSTORF, "σημεῖον", 241.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ S. zu ihm bes. RENGSTORF, ebd., 209, 214f, 219f (vgl. 205), und F. STOLZ, "Zeichen und Wunder. Die prophetische Legitimation und ihre Geschichte", ZTK 69 (1972) 125-144.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Nur vier der 18, mit Ex 7,3 einsetzenden Belege des hebräischen Textes für die zweigliedrige Formulierung haben es nicht mit dem Exodus und den Folgeereignissen zu tun (s. RENGSTORF, "σημεῖον", 214, 219).

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Vor allem auf Jes 8,18; 20,3 und Dtn 13,2f ist hier zu verweisen; es ist darüber hinaus die Vorstellung von Mose als einer prophetischen Gestalt (vgl. z.B. Dtn 34,10f) wahrscheinlich dafür verantwortlich, daß unsere Formel in der Exodusüberlieferung ihren festen Platz fand (s. dazu STOLZ, "Zeichen", bes. 135-139).

⁽⁵⁸⁾ S. dazu STOLZ, ebd., passim.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ RENGSTORF, "σημεῖον", 240, urteilt aufgrund der Relation zwischen Apg 2,19 und Joel 3,3 sowie zwischen Apg 7,36 und Ex 7,3, "daß dem Verf der Apg der Bezug der Wendung auf die Zeit des Auszugs aus Ägypten bewußt war".

angereichert ist⁽⁶⁰⁾. Besonders aufschlußreich ist hier 2 Thess 2,9, wo nicht anders als in Mk 13,22 (vgl. Mt 24,24) letztlich auf die Verführung durch falsche Propheten, wie sie in Dtn 13,2-6 charakterisiert ist, zurückgegriffen werden dürfte⁽⁶¹⁾. Ähnlich wird es etwa auch mit der (χάρις und der) δύναμις von Apg 6,8 stehen, sofern Stephanus nicht nur durch das ποιεῖν von “Wundern und (großen) Zeichen” mit Mose (Apg 7,36) zusammengedrückt wird⁽⁶²⁾, sondern auch noch durch (χάρις und) σοφία (Apg 6,3.8.10; 7,10.22⁽⁶³⁾). Angesichts solchen neutestamentlichen, paulinischen und lukanischen Rückgriffs auf die Formel “Zeichen und Wunder” des Alten Testaments ist natürlich keineswegs ausgemacht, daß (Hebr) 2,4 dezidiert von 2 Kor 12,12 und anderen paulinischen sowie lukanischen Stellen her verstanden werden muß, an denen allein Wunder der frühchristlichen Zeit thematisch sind. Nimmt man erstens die Vertrautheit des Hebräerbriefverfassers mit dem Alten Testament hinzu⁽⁶⁴⁾ und zweitens, daß dort im Zusammenhang mit den “Zeichen und Wundern” des Exodus (und der Propheten) der Terminus δύναμις schon gelegentlich begegnet⁽⁶⁵⁾ und pneumatische Momente⁽⁶⁶⁾ — mithin

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Vgl. STOLZ, “Zeichen”, 143, Anm. 74. In Apg 4,30 tritt nicht δύναμις, sondern ἰσχύς hinzu.

⁽⁶¹⁾ Dafür spricht neben der Wunderterminologie (vgl. H. BALZ, “τέρας”, *EWNT* II, 838-840, 839) dies, daß das Motiv vom πλανᾶν aus Dtn 13,6 auch in 2 Thess 2,11 und Mk 13,22 erscheint.

⁽⁶²⁾ So auch RENGSTORF, “σημεῖον”, 240.

⁽⁶³⁾ Apg 6,3.10; 7,10.22 sind die einzigen Acta-Belege für σοφία! Vgl. mit Apg 7,22 außer Apg 6,8 noch Röm 15,19 (sowie Lk 24,19).

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Vgl. dazu die o. Anm. 2 genannte Literatur.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Besondere Beachtung darf der freilich späte Beleg Bar 2,11 beanspruchen, bei dem es in der Mitte einer fünfteiligen Aufzählung, die Gottes Handeln beim Exodus betrifft, heißt: ἐν σημείοις καὶ ἐν τέρασιν καὶ ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλης. Aber auch schon die Stelle Ex 7,4 (V.3: “Zeichen und Wunder” [s.o. Anm. 56]) ist zu nennen, der sich Weish 11,20 und 3 Makk 2,6 zuordnen lassen. Aus dem letztgenannten Vers verdient im übrigen im Blick auf (Hebr) 2,4 die Formulierung Erwähnung, der Erweis der δύναμις Gottes sei durch die Prüfung ποικίλαις καὶ πολλαῖς... τιμωρίαις (vgl. Weish 19,13 zu τιμωρίαι) erfolgt.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Sie sind schon wegen der (o. [bei] Anm. 57) angesprochenen Verbindung zwischen unserer Formel und dem prophetischen Bereich zu erwarten. Vor allem die folgenden Stellen können als Bestätigung gelten: Dtn 4,36 (nach 4,34); 13,2-6; 26,8LXX; 34,9-12; Jes 8,16-20; Jer 39(32),20f; 2 Esr(Neh) 19(9),20.30 (nach 19[9],10) (vgl. ferner Weish 8,8; 10,16).

zumindest damit⁽⁶⁷⁾ gewisse Analoga auch zu den “vielfältigen Kräften und Zuteilungen des Heiligen Geistes” von (Hebr) 2,4 — nicht fehlen, so ist vom diachronen Arbeitsgang aus mindestens ebenso gut ein anderes, sozusagen alttestamentliches Verständnis des Verses möglich. Weiter kann nur der Hebräerbrief selbst helfen.

Hat man die alt- und neutestamentlichen Vergleichsstellen im Ohr oder vor Augen, so fällt bei (Hebr) 2,(3-)4 sogleich auf, daß hier Personen oder Kreise, durch welche Gott Wunderhaftes ausrichtete, nicht genannt werden⁽⁶⁸⁾; denn das hat zwar bei den “Zeichen und Wundern” des Alten Testaments zahlreiche deutliche Entsprechungen⁽⁶⁹⁾, nicht aber bei denen des Neuen, wo vielmehr, jedenfalls soweit (anders als in Joh 4,48 und 2 Thess 2,9 [vgl. noch Apg 2,19]) konkrete geschene Taten gemeint sind, durchweg die direkt beteiligten Akteure kenntlich gemacht sind⁽⁷⁰⁾. Schon diese Beobachtung läßt sehr skeptisch von der Möglichkeit denken, 2,4 dennoch nach Analogie neutestamentlicher “Parallelen” zu interpretieren. Es kommt nun aber noch der überaus gravierende Tatbestand hinzu, daß der Hebräerbrief zumindest jenseits unserer Stelle nirgends auf solche Geschehnisse im Leben Jesu oder der frühen Gemeinde Bezug nimmt, wie man sie bei dem so, “neutestamentlich”, verstandenen Ausdruck “Zeichen und Wunder” assoziieren muß, während andererseits nicht nur in Kap. 11 (bes. in V.33-35) staunenswerte Ereignisse der alttestamentlichen Zeit angesprochen werden, sondern überdies und vor allem schon in 3,9f die *ἐργα* Gottes während der Wüstenwanderung zur Sprache kommen⁽⁷¹⁾!

(67) Die Vorsicht ist dadurch bedingt, daß nicht eben leicht zu sagen ist, ob man angesichts der Zusammengehörigkeit des dritten und vierten Glieds der Aufreihung von (Hebr) 2,4 (s. dazu o. [bei] Anm. 51) die *δυνάμεις* im Sinne der sämtlich den Singular bietenden *δυνάμις*-Belege von Anm. 65 begreifen darf (vgl. zum Problem MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 130, ferner u. [bei] Anm. 72).

(68) Daß die *ἀκούσαντες* als Handelnde in Frage kämen, ist durch nichts angedeutet (vgl. GRÄBER, “Heil”, 268f).

(69) S. bes. Ex 7,3; Dtn 4,34; 6,21f; 7,19; 26,8; Jer 39(32),20f; Ps 77(78),43; 134(135),9; Neh 9,10 (vgl. noch Dtn 29,2, auch Sir 36,5). Anders: Dtn 34,10-12 sowie Ex 11,9fLXX (vgl. Ex 7,9LXX, ferner Jes 8,18; 20,3).

(70) S. Apg 2,22.43; 4,30; 5,12; 14,2f; 15,12; 2 Kor 12,12, ferner Apg 8,13 (wo V. 6 auf Philippus zu beziehen zwingt), indes auch Apg 7,35f. Vgl. Röm 15,18f sowie Mk 16,17f.20.

(71) Daß die “*ἐργα* in V. 9 übereinstimmend mit dem hebräischen Text (sc. der hier benutzten alttestamentlichen Vorlage Ps 94[95],7-11) und der

Nicht ganz so eindeutig ist das Bild, welches sich im Hebräerbrief hinsichtlich des pneumatischen Moments der Aufreihung von 2,4 darbietet. Denn dem Zusammenhang nach (s. nur 6,1) ist in 6,4f bei den μέτοχοι πνεύματος ἁγίου, welche “das gute Wort Gottes und die δυνάμεις des kommenden Äons geschmeckt haben”⁽⁷²⁾, fraglos an Christen zu denken. Aber das heißt, wie gerade aus 3,7-4,11 erhellt⁽⁷³⁾, erstens nicht, daß ihre Situation dem auctor ad Hebraeos als völlig singulär gilt, und zweitens ist keineswegs impliziert, für ihn gehöre die Wirksamkeit des heiligen Geistes nur oder primär in die Zeit, die irgendwie mit dem irdischen Jesus einsetzte (s. 1,2). Vielmehr begegnet der Begriff “heiliger Geist” ansonsten nur mit Bezug auf das Alte Testament: in 3,7 und 10,15 in Hinführung auf Zitate (Ps 94[95],7-11; Jer 38[31],33f), in denen es um verheißendes Reden (gehen soll oder gar) geht, und ähnlich ist in 9,8 daran gedacht, daß “der Heilige Geist... auch durch das Wort des Gesetzes zu uns reden kann”⁽⁷⁴⁾. Außerdem ist zu beachten, daß sich zu dem Zeugnis Gottes ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς der Ausdruck πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, mit

Septuaginta als Wundertaten Gottes zu verstehen” sind und in V.9f demgemäß bei der von Ps 94(95),9f abweichenden syntaktischen Einordnung der τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη (anders als in [Hebr] 3,17) “die Rede von vierzig Jahren göttlicher Wundererweisung” ist, hat HOFIUS, *Katapausis*, 117-131 (Zitate: 129), überzeugend nachgewiesen. Wenn er deshalb sagen kann (ebd., Anm. 882 [zu 142]): “Den Hebr 2,4 erwähnten ‘Zeichen’ und ‘Wundern’ entsprechen die ‘Werke’ Gottes in Hebr 3,9b”, so ist dieser Folgerung nicht leicht zu entgehen. Aber man wird dabei wohl noch konsequenter als HOFIUS selbst sein müssen, der ebd., 142, die Stelle 2,4 (neben 6,4f) als einen Beleg dafür anführt, man habe in der christlichen “Gemeinde schon Zeichen, Wunder und Kräfte des neuen Äons erfahren”.

(72) Wie hier der im Hebräerbrief nur zweimal (2,4; 6,5) verwandte Plural δυνάμεις in eschatologischem Zusammenhang erscheint, so in 7,16 der Singular (vgl. noch 1,3). Vgl. o. Anm. 67.

(73) Vgl. mit 6,4[f] nur 3,16f und 4,2.6, ferner das Resümee HOFIUS’ zum “Tertium comparationis...”, das in Hebr 3,7ff für die Gegenüberstellung von Wüstengeneration und christlicher Gemeinde ausschlaggebend ist: es “liegt darin, daß beide... die Verheißung des Eintritts in Gottes ‘Ruhestätte’ empfangen haben und unmittelbar vor der Erfüllung dieser Verheißung stehen” (*Katapausis*, 143; bei H. teils gesperrt) — weshalb die christlichen Leser “der tödlichen Gefahr..., der die Wüstengeneration erlegen ist und vor der auch sie keineswegs sicher sind” (ebd.), gewärtig zu sein haben.

(74) MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 306.

dem in 1,1 Gottes Reden "in den Propheten" charakterisiert wird, überaus gut — und zwar chiasmisch — fügt.

Faßt man diese Beobachtungen zusammen, wird man sagen müssen, der Hebräerbriefer selbst empfehle es, 2,4 auf Geschehnisse in alttestamentlicher Zeit zu beziehen.

2. Bestätigungsterminologie

Für das Verständnis des συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ von 2,4 auf Mk 16,20 — und nicht nur auf Apg 14,3 — zu verweisen⁽⁷⁵⁾, ist natürlich insofern etwas heikel, als dort nicht συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν oder ein anderer Terminus der Wortfamilie, sondern βεβαιοῦν verwandt ist⁽⁷⁶⁾. Andererseits ist nicht nur das letztere Verb unmittelbar vorher, in (Hebr) 2,3c, benutzt worden, sondern es liegt auch die Annahme eines inhaltlichen Bezuges zwischen den benachbarten Wörtern nahe; denn wie βεβαιοῦν hier deutlich juristischen Klang hat⁽⁷⁷⁾, so ist das bei jener Wortfamilie immerhin naheliegend⁽⁷⁸⁾, und bei dieser Verbindung dürfte(n) die Vorsilbe(n) des Kompositums ein Zusammenstimmen des Zeugnisses mit soeben Angesprochenem⁽⁷⁹⁾ andeuten. Die Erweiterung des Vergleichsspektrums führt indes nur zu diesem einen Beleg Mk 16,20; wo nämlich sonst im Neuen Testament βεβαιοῦν oder andere Vokabeln dieses Stammes gebraucht werden, fehlt es zwar nicht an interessanten und wichtigen Sachparallelen dazu, daß in (Hebr) 2,3c etwas (Verheißenes) als für einen bestimmten Kreis gültig erwiesen wird (s. bes. Röm 4,16 [vgl. den Kontext, bes. V. 23f!]; 15,8 [vgl. V. 4]; 2 Kor 1,21 [vgl. V. 20]; 2 Petr 1,19; vgl. 1 Kor 1,6)⁽⁸⁰⁾, wohl aber zur Bestätigung durch Wunderhaftes (doch vgl. 2 Petr 1,16-18). Den Belegen für diese konzise Vorstellung wird man indes auch noch Apg 2,22 und 1 Kor 2,4 zurechnen können, da hier mit ἀποδεικνύναι und

⁽⁷⁵⁾ S. z.B. BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 50.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Vgl. RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 31, Anm. 84.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ S. dazu o. (bei) Anm. 28-30.44.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ S. dazu nur H. STRATHMANN, "μάρτυς κτλ.", *TWNT* IV, 477-520, bes. 479f.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ S. ebd., 515f. Vgl. das συνεργεῖν von Mk 16,20.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ Vgl. o. (bei) Anm. 43, wo nicht zuletzt 1 Petr 1,10f Beachtung im Blick auf (Hebr) 2,3f verdient: nicht nur sind hier die Propheten als οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες charakterisiert, sondern die χάρις hat es überdies mit der σωτηρία zu tun, und dem προφητεύειν steht das προμαρτύρεσθαι parallel.

ἀπόδειξις ein Lexem verwandt ist, das, obwohl es in (Hebr) 2,3f keine Rolle spielt, inhaltlich doch der Zeugnisterminologie recht nahe steht⁽⁸¹⁾.

Von den gesammelten Vergleichsstellen (Mk 16,20; Apg 2,22; 14,3; 1 Kor 2,4) gehören die Belege Mk 16,20; Apg 2,22 und Apg 14,3, welche die Bestätigung mittels eines Verbs ausdrücken, insofern untereinander und mit (Hebr) 2,4 besonders eng zusammen, als dieses durchweg als Partizip verwandt ist und von den Wundertermini jeweils mindestens σημεῖα erscheint. Obwohl beides in 1 Kor 2,4 nicht der Fall ist, verdient es doch Beachtung, daß der Vers mit πνεῦμα und δύναμις Begriffe bietet, die in etwa dem zweiten Paar der Viereraufreihung von (Hebr) 2,4 korrespondieren. Es wird deshalb von einer gewissen formalen und sprachlichen Verwandtschaft zwischen 2,4 und jenen Stellen gesprochen werden können. Aber davor, von hier aus 2,3c.4 auf die frühchristliche Verkündigung und ihre Bestätigung zu deuten, warnt doch, führt man den Vergleich noch kurz fort, zweierlei.

Zum einen ist das beobachtete “Schema”, wie weiter oben angesprochen, in Apg 2,22 weder auf die apostolische Zeit noch auch explizit auf Wortmitteilung, sondern auf Jesus und sein Tun bezogen. Das “Schema” scheint also für unterschiedliche Verwendung offen zu sein. Dementsprechend haben es denn auch Apg 14,3 und 1 Kor 2,4 (vgl. V. 1) mit ganz speziellen Situationen zu tun. Lediglich der Vers Mk 16,20 vermittelt den Eindruck von Grundsätzlichkeit, und das darf wohl auch deshalb nicht so ausgewertet werden, als sei sie fest und traditionell mit jenem “Schema” verbunden gewesen, weil der sogenannte lange Markusschluß (Mk 16,9-20) der relativ späte Versuch sein wird, unterschiedliche Überlieferungsstücke zu harmonisieren und zu summieren⁽⁸²⁾.

Zum anderen nimmt (Hebr) 2,4 schon insofern eine Sonderstellung ein, als hier unmißverständlich und zumindest betonter als an den Vergleichsstellen die Bestätigung als eine durch Gott selbst (2,4a; vgl. V. 4c) gegebene gekennzeichnet ist⁽⁸³⁾. Ganz im Unterschied zu 2,4 ist nämlich fraglos in Mk 16,20 (s. V. 19), vielleicht je-

⁽⁸¹⁾ Vgl. dazu nur Röm 2,15: ἐνδείκνυσθαι neben συμμαρτυρεῖν.

⁽⁸²⁾ Vgl. dazu nur A. WIKENHAUSER – J. SCHMID, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Freiburg etc. 1973) 221-224, bes. 221f.

⁽⁸³⁾ Vgl. BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 50.

doch auch in Apg 14,3⁽⁸⁴⁾, Jesus der Bestätigende. Und wenn es sich auch in Apg 2,22 anders verhält, so ist doch dabei, da die Wunder als "durch ihn", den Nazoräer, geschehene beschrieben werden, ebenso deutlich die Person Jesu im Blickfeld wie im Kontext von 1 Kor 2,4, wo zwar der folgende Vers auf die δύναμις θεοῦ verweist, diese aber zuvor, in 1 Kor 1,24, mit Christus nahezu identifiziert wurde.

Angesichts dieser beiden Punkte muß für das συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν von (Hebr) 2,4 eine überzeugende Interpretation vom Hebräerbrief selbst aus versucht werden.

In ihm spricht nun sogleich die Verwendung der betreffenden Wortfamilie nachdrücklich gegen ein Verständnis unseres Zusammenhangs, das ihn nach Analogie etwa von Apg 14,3 auf Bestätigung von Verkündigung im neutestamentlichen Bereich bezöge. Jenseits von (Hebr) 2,4 haben es nämlich die Wörter dieses Stammes in unserem Brief gerade und durchweg mit alttestamentlichen Sachverhalten zu tun⁽⁸⁵⁾! Das gilt in einer zumindest auf den ersten Blick nicht sonderlich auffälligen Weise für die Substantive μαρτύριον (3,5 [auf Mose bezogen]) und μάρτυς (10,28 [gemäß Dtn 17,6]; 12,1 [Gestalten Israels von Kap. 11]). Spezifischer wirkt die Verwendung der Verben⁽⁸⁶⁾: Bei dem recht unmittelbar auf 2,4 folgenden Beleg 2,6a wird mittels des διαμαρτύρεσθαι die Zitation von Ps 8,5-7 vorbereitet, also der Schriftbeleg solchermaßen unmißverständlich als ein autoritatives Wort gekennzeichnet⁽⁸⁷⁾. Ähnlich verhält es sich auch bei dem Simplex μαρτυρεῖν. Dessen Passiv wird nicht nur in 11,2.4a.5.39 dem "exegetischen Sprachgebrauch der hellenistischen Synagoge"⁽⁸⁸⁾ entsprechen, sondern zielt ebenfalls in 7,8, wo Zusammenhang und Sinn (vgl. V. 3.16f) durch Bezugnahmen auf Gen 14,17-20 und Ps 109(110),4 bestimmt sind, und natürlich in 7,17a auf das Alte Testament, da es hier wieder um die Einführung eines Schriftwortes geht, und zwar nun eben aus Ps 109(110),4. Das Aktiv wird in 10,15 entsprechend in der Einleitung eines weiteren für den Brief wichtigen Zitats, nämlich aus Jer 38(31),33f, verwandt; und beim noch verbleibenden Beleg, 11,4b, dessen μαρτυροῦντος... τοῦ

⁽⁸⁴⁾ So z.B. Th. ZAHN, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lucas*, II (KNT V,2; Leipzig 3/*1927) 461. Vgl. Apg 20,32.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ Vgl. STRATHMANN, "μάρτυς", 501f.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ Vgl. ebd., 501, 518 (vgl. 516).

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Vgl. o. Anm. 42.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 380, Anm. 1 (der besonders auf Philo verweist).

θεοῦ 2,4 sprachlich besonders nahesteht, liegt Interpretation von Gen 4,4 vor⁽⁸⁹⁾. Die zumindest bei Absehung von 2,4 völlig homogene Verwendung der Wortfamilie drängt dazu, auch das συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν dieses Verses irgendwie auf das Alte Testament zu beziehen, und stützt damit unsere Aufstellung vom Reden Gottes in 2,3.

Die These gewinnt auf diesem Hintergrund überdies an Konkrektion und Profil:

Erstens nämlich ist das Nebeneinander von ἐμαρτυρήθη und μαρτυροῦντος in 11,4 aufschlußreich. Wenn hier nämlich einer Abels Gerechtigkeit betreffenden gültigen, letztlich auf Gott zurückgehenden Aussage⁽⁹⁰⁾ noch ein Bezeugen durch Gott zur Seite gestellt wird, so entspricht das dem, daß die Gültigerklärung (ἐβεβαιώθη) des Heils für die ἡμεῖς (2,3), für welches das Reden des Kyrios Voraussetzung war, nicht allein bleibt, und es erhellt außerdem, warum dann von einem Mitbezeugen (συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος) gesprochen wird: schon die Gültigerklärung war ein Bezeugen⁽⁹¹⁾.

Zweitens wird vor allem von 10,15-18 aus noch deutlicher, woran bei diesem Bezeugen zu denken ist, und zwar sowohl in formaler als auch in inhaltlicher Hinsicht. Formal: Wiewohl fraglos der Kyrios spricht (s. V. 16), kann doch der heilige Geist als bezeugend dargestellt werden (V. 15); es handelt sich also, wie angesichts des ähnlichen Sachverhalts in 3,7 und 4,7 wohl formuliert werden darf, um ein Reden Gottes ἐν Ἱερεμίᾳ, mithin offenbar um einen Spezialfall des göttlichen Redens ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (1,1). Inhaltlich: Das Zeugnis gilt den ἡμεῖς (10,15), und es betrifft die Endzeit (s. 10,16-18).

Drittens: Während es in 11,4a bei der letztlich auf die πίστις Abels zurückgeführten Bezeugung um die Aussage geht, er sei gerecht, handelt es sich beim Zeugnis Gottes in 11,4b, wo ja das ἐπεῖδεν (Theodotion: ἐνεπύρισεν) ὁ θεὸς... ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ von Gen 4,4 zugrundeliegt, um eine Reaktion und Aktivität Gottes unmittelbar auf die Gaben dieses Opfernden hin⁽⁹²⁾. Wenn damit

⁽⁸⁹⁾ S. ebd., 384.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ Zwar fehlt im Alten Testament ein direkter Beleg für Abels Gerechtigkeit; aber es muß sich schon angesichts der Parallele Mt 23,35 (vgl. 1 Joh 3,12) bei dieser Charakterisierung um ziemlich feste Auslegungstradition handeln.

⁽⁹¹⁾ Vgl. o. bei Anm. 79.

⁽⁹²⁾ Soviel läßt sich auch ohne die allerdings naheliegende Annahme sagen, der auctor ad Hebraeos denke hier mit der u.a. aus dem Theodotion-Text erschließbaren exegetischen Tradition (s. zu weiteren Belegen BRAUN,

hier⁽⁹³⁾ im Hebräerbrief das Nebeneinander eines Zeugnisses durch das Wort und eines solchen durch die Tat⁽⁹⁴⁾ für den alttestamentlichen Bereich zumindest angedeutet ist, darf eine entsprechende Auffassung von 2,3f nun als wahrscheinlich gelten⁽⁹⁵⁾ und einer Interpretation von Mk 16,20 aus vorgezogen werden.

Wie sich die neue Sicht von 2,3f, nach der es hier um verheißende, alttestamentlicher Zeit zugehörnde Ansage und sie begleitendes Handeln Gottes geht⁽⁹⁶⁾, in den näheren und weiteren Kontext einpaßt, bleibt nun noch anzudeuten.

III. (Bessere) Kontexteinbettung beim Paradigma "Reden Gottes"

1. 2,1-4

Was zunächst den Passus 2,1-4 angeht, so war (o. unter I) schon festzustellen, daß mit der Interpretation des κύριος auf Gott selbst hin dieses Textsegment leichter verständlich ist und geschlossener wirkt als bei herkömmlicher Anschauung: Daß Gottes Reden den Anfang des Heils markiert (V. 3b), vermag einzuleuchten, und bei der das Hören (V. 1a.3c; vgl. V. 2b) betreffenden Terminologie

Hebräer, 344) daran, Gott habe Abels Opfer durch (vom Himmel herabgesandtes) Feuer verzehren lassen (vgl. DELITZSCH, *Hebräer*, 534).

⁽⁹³⁾ Im folgenden Vers, 11,5 (vgl. Gen 5,24), liegen die Dinge ganz ähnlich: Henoch wurde entrückt (Tat); vorher hatte er das Zeugnis empfangen, Gott wohlzugefallen (Wort). Vgl. noch 6,5.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Vgl. J. A. CRAMER (ed.), *Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, VII (Oxonii 1844) 244.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ Vgl. das συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν von 1 Clem 23,5; 43,1 (vgl. 1 Clem 17,1f).

⁽⁹⁶⁾ Dieses Miteinander hat, wie schon (o. [bei] Anm. 57f.66) angesprochen, im Alten Testament nicht zuletzt im prophetischen Bereich Entsprechungen. Wenn die Septuaginta in diesem Zusammenhang verschiedentlich διαμαρτύρεσθαι (bzw. ἐπιμαρτύρεσθαι) bietet, könnte das für die traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung von (Hebr) 2,3f von Relevanz sein. Daß die Vokabel an einer Stelle, in Sach 3,6, eine positive Zusage meint, ist für uns weniger von Belang als dies, daß das Verb dabei "gewöhnlich... von der warnenden prophetischen Bußpredigt" (STRATHMANN, "μάρτυς", 518) gebraucht ist. Nach dem Kontext der Mehrzahl der Belege (4[2] Kön 17,13; 2 Esr[Neh] 19[9],26.[29.30.]34; Ps 80[81],9; Ez 16,2; 20,4) ergehen die Mahnungen unter Rekurs auf Gottes heilvolles Tun bei der Herausführung aus Ägypten und benennen eine (zeitweilige) negative Wendung des Geschicks. Von hierher kann nicht nur Licht auf das Verhältnis von Wort und Tat in (Hebr) 2,3f fallen, sondern — zumal bei Berücksichtigung von 3,7-4,11 sowie 8,7-13 (vgl. Apg 2,14-40; 3,12-26; 7,1-53; 1 Kor 10,1-13, ferner die o. bei Anm. 80 genannten Stellen) — speziell darauf, inwiefern das Heil nun den ἡμεῖς gilt. Vgl. u. bei Anm. 118.

liegt dann ebenso Homogenität des Sprachgebrauchs vor wie bei dem Vokabular, das es mit der “Festigkeit” zu tun hat (V. 2a.3c). Von daher kann überdies der spiegelbildliche Aufbau der Passage, den Vanhoye⁽⁹⁷⁾ behauptet und wie folgt zu skizzieren versucht hat, erst hinreichend gewürdigt werden:

...	ἔβειναιώθη ...
. ἡμᾶς εἰς ἡμᾶς
. τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν τῶν ἀκουσάντων
. δι’ ἀγγέλων διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου
. λαληθεῖς λαλεῖσθαι
. λόγος. σωτηρίας
. βέβαιος.	
. παράβασις ἀμελήσαντες
. μισθαποδοσίαν ἐκφευζόμεθα
. πῶς ἡμεῖς

Zwar tritt bei diesem Tableau nicht genügend hervor, daß den zwei Elementen (V. 2; V. 3f) des hier begegnenden Schlusses a minore ad maius⁽⁹⁸⁾ der Ertrag der Beweisführung in der Art einer propositio⁽⁹⁹⁾ vorangestellt ist (V. 1)⁽¹⁰⁰⁾; aber daß die propositio sich zum Nachweis selbst, zur probatio, fügt, wird sehr schön deutlich. Näherhin läßt sich nun im Zusammenhang mit unserem Interpretationsvorschlag viel prononcierter als ohne ihn sagen: Während beim ἀκούειν einfache Korrespondenz (zwischen propositio und probatio) vorliegt, handelt es sich (zumindest) bei den Paaren δι’ ἀγγέλων/διὰ τοῦ κυρίου und λόγος/σωτηρία(ς) (der probatio) um Überbietung⁽¹⁰¹⁾, und zwar insofern, als es dann nicht um zwei göttliche Werkzeuge geht, sondern um die Engel einerseits, Gott andererseits⁽¹⁰²⁾, und als nicht kaum Vergleichbares wie Wortmitteilung und außersprachlicher Sachverhalt, sondern dem nicht weiter gekennzeichneten λόγος die gerade mit Gottes Reden gesetzte heilvolle Wirklichkeit⁽¹⁰³⁾ gegenübergestellt wird. Es kommt demnach

⁽⁹⁷⁾ *Structure*, 74-77, bes. 76. Vgl. nur ebd., 37, zu formalen Möglichkeiten, die dem auctor ad Hebraeos in reichem Maße zur Verfügung stehen.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ Diese auch im rabbinischen Bereich — und zwar unter der Bezeichnung qal wāḥomer — geläufige Figur (vgl. zu ihr H. LAUSBERG, *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik* [München ³1967] §41, ferner F. SIEGERT, *Argumentation bei Paulus, gezeigt an Röm 9-11* [WUNT 34; Tübingen 1985] 190f) begegnet im Hebräerbrief des öfteren (s. dazu nur BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 48), beispielsweise auch in 9,13f. Vgl. u. bei Anm. 128.

⁽⁹⁹⁾ Vgl. zu dieser Kategorie LAUSBERG, *Elemente*, §370.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Vgl. z.B. ZIMMER, “Hebr. 2,1-5”, 419.

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Vgl. z.B. RIGGENBACH, *Hebräer*, 29f.

⁽¹⁰²⁾ Vgl. dazu o. (bei) Anm. 23, 41.

⁽¹⁰³⁾ S. dazu o. (bei) Anm. 45.

so zwischen den beiden Elementen der "logischen" Figur weder zur Einebnung noch zur Diastase, sondern, wie es sein muß, eben zur Überbietung.

Bei der derart inhaltlich bestimmten symmetrischen Abfolge, bei welcher mit (πῶς) ἡμεῖς etwas wie das Zentrum einer Spiegelung gegeben ist, fällt eine Besonderheit sofort ins Auge, nämlich die Nachordnung des ἐβεβαιώθη, welche insofern angesichts des ansonsten konzentrischen Aufbaus eine — die einzige — Irregularität darstellt, als der korrespondierende Ausdruck ἐγένετο βέβαιος einen Platz gegen Beginn des zweiten Elements erwarten lassen würde. Auch in bezug auf diesen Tatbestand hilft die Neuinterpretation des Kyrios-Begriffs weiter. Zunächst läßt sich präzisieren: Nicht nur das ἐβεβαιώθη kommt erstaunlich weit hinten zu stehen, sondern auch das mit ihm schon wegen des ähnlichen juridischen Klangs zusammengehörende⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ nachfolgende Partizip und deshalb V. 4 insgesamt. Die somit gravierende Achterlastigkeit, durch welche über die ja schon an sich herausgehobene Stellung des Wir (V. 1a.3a.c) hinaus das εἰς ἡμᾶς extrem gewichtet wird, wäre nun weder nötig noch sinnvoll, wenn es V. 3 (unmittelbar) mit Jesus und seinem Wort zu tun hätte; denn dann wäre die Ausrichtung auf die christliche Gemeinde nur natürlich, naheliegend. Die Betonung ist hingegen unerläßlich, wenn es um Gottes Reden in alttestamentlicher Zeit, zumal ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (s. 1,1), geht. Es ist ja alles andere als selbstverständlich, daß solches Sprechen nicht (nur) die zeitgenössischen Hörer betrifft, sondern gerade (auch) die ἡμεῖς.

2. 1,1–4,13

Daß sich mit dem vorgeschlagenen "Paradigmenwechsel" auch der beiderseitige Anschluß unseres Textsegments zunächst insofern problemlos⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ darstellt, als vorher (1,1f.5.6.7.13) und nachher (2,6)

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Vgl. dazu o. bei Anm. 91, 94f, ferner bei Anm. 28f.

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Als problematisch könnte indes vielleicht erscheinen, daß dort, wo der κύριος-Begriff vor 2,3 zum letzten Mal gebraucht wird, nämlich in 1,10, fraglos (und übrigens durchaus in Anknüpfung an die Bedeutung der im wesentlichen aufgenommenen Septuaginta-Formulierung von Ps 101[102],26 [s. dazu L. D. HURST, "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2", *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament* (ed. L. D. HURST – N. T. WRIGHT) (Oxford 1987) 151-164, 160-162]) Jesus gemeint ist (den nicht zuletzt eben deshalb A. VANHOYE, *Situation du Christ* [LD 58; Paris 1969] 242, auch als den Kyrios von 2,3 versteht). Es handelt sich dort jedoch anders als in 2,3 um die Anrede κύριε, und sie ist überdies Teil eines Zitats

Gott als Redender erscheint, wurde (ebenfalls o. unter I) schon angesprochen. Zusätzlich ist nun darauf hinzuweisen, daß man überhaupt den ersten Hauptteil des Briefs als durch das Thema: “Reden Gottes und Reaktion der Hörenden” bestimmt auffassen kann⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. Das ist besonders naheliegend, wenn man den Ausgang des ersten großen Abschnitts dieser Schrift als mit 4,12f gegeben ansieht⁽¹⁰⁷⁾, wo der λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ insbesondere durch eine Kette von Merkmalen charakterisiert wird.

Wie gut sich 2,1-4, reinterpretiert, in diesen Rahmen fügen kann, sei mit einigen kräftigen Strichen zu umreißen versucht. Bezieht man 1,1f bzw. (der durchgehenden, kunstvollen Periode wegen⁽¹⁰⁸⁾) 1,1-4 und 4,12f aufeinander und darf man angesichts des hier besonders betonten Wir⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ die Passagen 2,1-4 und 3,7-4,11 als

(vgl. dazu o. bei Anm. 12). Und wenn unlängst J.H. ULRICHSEN, “Διαφορώτερον ὄνομα in Hebr. 1,4”, *ST* 38 (1984) 65-75, die These erneuert hat, in 1,4 sei wie in Phil 2,9(-11) an den Kyrios-Titel für Jesus und nicht an den Sohnesnamen gedacht, wie denn bei der Fortsetzung “in V. 10... der Höhepunkt erreicht” (ebd., 66) werde, so spricht dagegen vor allem der Aufbau von 1,2b-4, sofern dies hymnische, kunstvoll gegliederte Stück (s. dazu nur u. [bei] Anm. 108) durchgängig von dem ἐν ᾧ in 1,2a abhängig ist, und ferner das Gewicht, das dann die Zitatenskombination in 1,5 auf den Sohnesbegriff legt, der überdies — im Unterschied zu κύριος — in 1,8 vom auctor ad Hebraeos auch ohne Bindung durch eine alttestamentliche Formulierung benutzt wird. — Als problematisch könnte übrigens bei der Einbettung des κύριος von 2,3 in den Kontext möglicherweise auch empfunden werden (s. HOFMANN, *Schrift*, 100; kritisch zu seinen diesbezüglichen Bemerkungen schon ZIMMER, “Hebr. 2,1-5”, 451f Anm.), daß nach unserem Vorschlag in 2,3f Gott recht kurz hintereinander zweimal genannt würde, und zwar als κύριος (2,3b) und als θεός (2,4a; vgl. 2,4c v.l.); für den Verfasser des Briefs bedeutet das indes kein Problem, wie aus 8,10(Zitat); 10,29-31; 12,14f; 13,6f sowie aus 6,1-3; 6,5f; 6,17f; 11,4; 11,5; 12,28f; 13,15f erhellt.

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ Vgl. bes.: F.J. SCHIERSE, *Verheißung und Heilsvollendung* (MThS I,9; München 1955) 197; W. NAUCK, “Zum Aufbau des Hebräerbriefes”, *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche* (FS J. Jeremias; [ed. W. ELTESTER] BZNW 26; Berlin 1960) 199-206, 205f; E. GRÄBER, “Hebräer 1,1-4”, *Text und Situation* (Gütersloh 1973) 183-228 (zuerst: 1971), 203.

⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ So SCHIERSE, NAUCK und GRÄBER (s. die vorige Anmerkung).

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ Es kommt hinzu, daß sowohl 1,2b-4 als auch 4,12f hymnischen Charakter haben (s. NAUCK, “Aufbau”, 205).

⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ Es fehlt zwar auch dazwischen nicht ganz (s. 2,5.8.9; 3,6; vgl. 3,1: Ihr), begegnet dort aber jeweils unmittelbar oder doch recht dicht an der Grenze zu dem vorangehenden bzw. nachfolgenden paränetischen Abschnitt, sorgt also offenbar für die gute Verbindung der einzelnen Stücke (vgl. 1,14 sowie 2,3a mit 2,5 und 3,14 mit 3,6).

einander korrespondierend betrachten⁽¹¹⁰⁾ und sieht man sie durch die vorangehenden Erwägungen über die Engel bzw. Mose und Jesus vorbereitet⁽¹¹¹⁾, so zeigt sich folgende Struktur, bei welcher der christologisch und soteriologisch ausgerichtete Abschnitt 2,5-18 in der Mitte zu stehen kommt:

1,1-4 (Reden Gottes)		4,12-13 (Wort Gottes)
1,5-14 (Engel/Jesus)	2,5-18 (Jesu soterio- logische Funktion)	3,1-6 (Mose/Jesus)
2,1-4 (Wir [Gesetz/Propheten])		3,7-4,11 (Wir [Propheten/Jesus])

Dabei ergibt spätestens die Korrespondenz von 1,1f(f) und 4,12f, daß das Wort Gottes als einheitlich gesehen wird, das Reden Gottes "in den Propheten" und "im Sohn" also im Sinne einer Zuordnung zu begreifen ist⁽¹¹²⁾. Es kommt indes nicht sofort zu einer Explizierung dieses Zueinanders. Vielmehr wird im Anschluß an die hymnische⁽¹¹³⁾ Charakterisierung des Sohnes in 1,2b-3, bei der dessen soteriologische Rolle nur eben so anklingt (s. V.3c), zunächst seine besondere endzeitliche Stellung im Vergleich mit den traditionell (ebenfalls) zu Gottes Umgebung gerechneten Engeln⁽¹¹⁴⁾ konstatiert (1,4) und mit göttlicher Wortmitteilung, Zitaten aus dem Alten Testament, sozusagen veranschaulicht (1,5-14). Zumal bei diesem Vergleich Jesu Position dadurch hervorgehoben wird, daß Funktionen der Engel, zuletzt mit εἰς διακονίαν... διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν, benannt werden (V.6.7.14), liegen nun die Argumentationsmaterialien für 2,1-4 bereit (zu denen Jesu rettende Aufgabe eben noch nicht gehört), nämlich: Gottes Reden im alttestamentlichen Bereich, Engel und Ausrichtung auf das zukünftige Heil. Auf diesem Hintergrund verdeutlicht unsere Passage mittels des Schlusses a minore ad maius, daß nicht nur das Engel-Wort, das Gesetz, sich als rechtsgültig erwies, sondern auch das, was mit Gottes verheißendem, im Alten Testament dokumentierten Reden einsetzte. Es kommt als besonderer Ton hinzu,

⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Vgl. SCHIERSE, *Verheißung*, 197 (wo freilich 3,1-6 mit 3,7ff zusammengenommen wird), ferner o. (bei) Anm. 71.

⁽¹¹¹⁾ Vgl. z.B. MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 170.

⁽¹¹²⁾ Darauf dürfte indes auch schon die isolierte Betrachtung von 1,1f führen (s. GRÄBER, "Hebräer 1,1-4", 206f).

⁽¹¹³⁾ Vgl. nur o. Anm. 108.

⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Vgl. HOFIUS, *Christushymnus*, 87f.

daß die solchermaßen in Gang gesetzte σωτηρία (V.3) nicht (nur) die damaligen Hörer anging, vielmehr gerade (auch) “uns” gilt. Mit beidem ist (drittens) der christlichen Gemeinde gegenüber die Ermahnung gegeben, das “Gehörte” (V.1) festzuhalten und nicht nach Analogie der Gesetzesübertretungen aufs Spiel zu setzen.

Nicht ausdrücklich thematisiert ist indes bis zu dieser Stelle, welche Funktion Jesus in bezug auf das durch Gottes einstiges Reden erst angestoßene Heil zukommt und wie sie sich zu der Aufgabe der Engel verhält. Eben zu dieser notwendigen Klärung kommt es dann, ausgehend von einem Zeugnis (Gottes in) der Schrift (2,5-8), in 2,5-18, wo Jesu Weg im Blick nicht nur auf die Engel (V.5.7.9.16), sondern vor allem auf die “Brüder” (V.11) charakterisiert und das Amt dieses Mannes als das des ἀρχηγός τῆς σωτηρίας (V.10; vgl. 12,2, auch 5,9) und schließlich als das eines “treuen Hohenpriesters” (2,17) auf den Begriff gebracht wird.

Erst damit, daß hier so etwas wie eine Umschreibung des endzeitlichen Redens Gottes “im Sohn” geleistet ist, kann nun das Zueinander göttlichen Sprechens einerseits “in den Propheten”, andererseits “im Sohn” (s.1,1f) fruchtbar gemacht werden. Daß es (schon) 3,1-6 darum zu tun ist⁽¹¹⁵⁾, dürfte nicht nur aus der die Erörterung des Passus (s. V.5a; vgl. V.2 [dazu jedoch auch 1 Sam 2,35; 1 Chr 17,14]) weithin bestimmenden alttestamentlichen Stelle Num 12,7 erhellen, in deren Kontext Moses Gottunmittelbarkeit (s. bes. Num 12,8 und vgl. dazu Hebr 8,5!) und damit auch Prophetisches (s. bes. Num 12,6.8) hervorgehoben wird, sondern auch aus den folgenden Indizien: Mose wird abschließend als θεράπων εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων (V.5b) charakterisiert⁽¹¹⁶⁾, auf

⁽¹¹⁵⁾ Vgl. HUGHES, *Hermeneutics*, 9-12. — Sozusagen zu Mose überzuwechseln lag sowohl von der Thematik der Engel her nahe (s. dazu M. R. D'ANGELO, *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews* [SBLDS 42; Missoula 1979] 123-127) als auch von der soeben in 2,17f angeschlagenen des Hohenpriestertums (vgl. dazu nur BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 73f).

⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Woran bei “den Dingen, die geredet werden sollen”, genau zu denken sein wird, ist, wie die Auslegungsgeschichte zeigt (s. dazu nur BRAUN, ebd., 32f), nicht eben leicht zu sagen. Gegen die “Erklärung von dem neutest. Evangelium, und zwar von diesem ausschliesslich” (DELITZSCH, *Hebräer*, 112), wird freilich der Plural sprechen (vgl. 1,2 neben 1,1). Den Ausdruck “von den Weisungen, besonders gesetzlicher Art, zu verstehen..., die er (sc. Mose) in der Stiftshütte empfangen und dann dem Volke ‘bezeugen’ soll” (STRATHMANN, “μάρτυς”, 510), ist indes noch heikler; denn das auffällige Partizip — es ist ja “im NT einziges Part Fut Pass” (BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 82) —, dürfte einen dezidierten Zukunftsbezug

Jesus wird nach Kap. 1 (V. 2.5.8) erstmals wieder der Terminus *υἱός* angewandt (3,6a; doch vgl. 2,6), und beide Personen werden — bei unverkennbarer Betonung Jesu — zum Haus Gottes (s. 3,2.3.5a.6a) in Beziehung gesetzt, das mit den *ἡμεῖς* identifiziert wird (3,6b).

Ist dem so, dann kann nun die Fortsetzung im Unterschied zu 2,1-4, wo Gesetz und alttestamentliches Reden Gottes (gerade auch "in den Propheten") verglichen wurden, den der Mahnung dienenden Vergleich eine Stufe höher ansetzen, also (kategorisierend und verkürzend gesagt): statt Gesetz/Propheten nun Propheten/Jesus. Für 3,7-4,11 ist nämlich charakteristisch⁽¹¹⁷⁾, daß die "Genossen Christi" (3,14) sich an der Wüstengeneration zu messen haben, der nach 4,2 nicht anders als "uns" *ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς* verkündigt worden war (vgl. 4,6). Daß er einst auf Ungehorsam (3,18; 4,6.11), Unglauben (3,19; vgl. 3,12; 4,2), stieß, bewirkte nicht nur, daß von den einstigen Hörern (3,16; 4,2) der "Verheißung, in die Ruhe einzugehen" (4,1), niemand dieses Ziel erreichte (3,11.16; 4,6.8), sondern auch, daß der heilige Geist (3,7) bzw. Gott nach einer gewissen Zeitspanne *ἐν Δαυὶδ* (4,7) sprach und mit dem Heute von Ps 94(95),7(-11) einen Tag bestimmte, dem die Adressaten des Briefs zugeordnet werden (3,13; vgl. 4,3.11)⁽¹¹⁸⁾. Weil hier, dem Verfasser nach, zwei Situationen nebeneinander stehen, die beide durch Gottes Reden hinsichtlich der bevorstehenden heilvollen Ruhe bestimmt sind (3,11.18; 4,1.3.5.8.10.11; vgl. 4,4.9), ist dieser Vergleich noch zwingender als der erste in 2,1-4, wo ja bei den Engeln eine Erwäh-

zum Ausdruck bringen. Ist dann vielleicht an ein Christuszeugnis des Mose selbst zu denken (so z.B. MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 177), insbesondere durch das für pneumatische Auslegung (s. dazu nur o. [bei] Anm. 74) offene (und unter visionären Umständen [s. 8,5; vgl. 11,26f] empfangene) Gesetz (so z.B. D'ANGELO, *Moses*, bes. 192, 198, und BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 83)? Auch bei dieser Auslegungslinie geht es nicht ohne Schwierigkeiten ab; im Blick auf die Promulgation des Gesetzes wäre wieder das Futur erstaunlich, und auch der Kontext stützt diese Deutung nicht. Er bietet indes ein pneumatisches Wort (3,7), das Gott *ἐν Δαυὶδ* weit nach der mosaischen Zeit ausrichtete (4,7). Zu diesem Wort paßt bei dem Partizip *λαληθησόμενα* von 3,5 das auf Gottes Redenweisende Passiv (vgl. MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 177, Anm. 1) gut (wenn nicht besser [vgl. dazu u. (bei) Anm. 119f]), es paßt überdies nun auch das Futur, ferner der Plural (s. dazu u. bei Anm. 120-126; vgl. 1,1). Es wird demnach dieses Partizip wahrscheinlich auf nachmosaisches verheißendes, zumal prophetisches Reden gehen (vgl. u. [bei] Anm. 123f, ferner o. bei Anm. 85-96).

⁽¹¹⁷⁾ Vgl. nur o. Anm. 73.

⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Vgl. o. Anm. 96.

nung Gottes als des Redenden fehlte⁽¹¹⁹⁾ und ihr Wort (trotz 1,14) nicht unmittelbar mit der σωτηρία in Zusammenhang gebracht wurde. Deshalb ist, so nachdrücklich 2,1-4 und 3,7-4,11 sich bei dem vorgeschlagenen Verständnis des κύριος von 2,3 gerade hinsichtlich der Ausrichtung von Gottes Reden im alttestamentlichen, prophetischen Bereich auf die ἡμεῖς hin stützen, doch einleuchtend, warum Mahnung und Warnung bezüglich der christlichen Gemeinde erst in dem letzteren Abschnitt zu voller Anschaulichkeit und Schärfe kommen. Damit leuchtet schließlich auch ohne weiteres der Anschluß von und Abschluß mit 4,12f ein. Mit der neuen Interpretation von 2,3f ist also im näheren Kontext und im gesamten ersten Hauptteil des Briefes gut durchzukommen, ja offenkundig besser als bei herkömmlicher Sicht der Dinge.

3. 1,1–12,29

Schon angesichts dessen darf es, wenn jetzt auch noch das übrige Schreiben in die Betrachtung einbezogen wird, mit wenigen Bemerkungen sein Bewenden haben. Eine eher inhaltliche und eine stärker auf die Struktur bezogene Erwägung seien noch vorgetragen:

(1) Hinsichtlich der Frage, wie der auctor ad Hebraeos die sich in alttestamentlichen Texten dokumentierende verheißende Ansage Gottes chronologisch einordnet, ist schon der Zusammenhang 3,7–4,11 recht aufschlußreich: Obwohl die Wüstenwanderung zeitlich mit Mose verbunden ist (s. 3,16), fehlt hier⁽¹²⁰⁾ jeder Hinweis darauf, daß Gott den λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς (4,2) durch diesen Mann habe ausrichten lassen. Der Schluß, die Ansage sei früher ergangen, wird durch den Rekurs von 4,4 auf das Ruhen Gottes gemäß Gen 2,2 gestützt. Mose hat die Zusage Gottes demnach sozusagen im Rücken, andererseits liegt ihre Aktualisierung aber auch, wie aus den zeitlichen Angaben von 4,7f hinsichtlich der Einordnung von Ps 94(95),7f(f) erhellt, vor ihm, erst recht natürlich ihre (volle) Realisierung (s. 4,3). Damit harmoniert auf der einen Seite, daß die Verheißungsterminologie (ἐπαγγελία, ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι), wo sie zunächst im Blick auf den alttestamentlichen Bereich verwandt ist, nahezu durchgängig⁽¹²¹⁾

⁽¹¹⁹⁾ Ähnlich wie in 2,2 (vgl. dazu o. Anm. 41) wird auch in 12,19 vermieden, direkt Gott als den, der spricht, namhaft zu machen ([doch] vgl. 12,25f und dazu u. [bei] Anm. 130). Vgl. 7,14; 9,19; 10,28.

⁽¹²⁰⁾ Im Unterschied zu 9,8 (vgl. dazu o. bei Anm. 74).

⁽¹²¹⁾ Ausnahme: 11,33 (wo es indes “nur” um konkrete und deshalb sozusagen in der Zeit ihre Erfüllung findende Zusagen gehen wird [vgl. 6,15; 11,11]).

mit Gestalten, die in Kap. 11 vor Mose (V. 23ff) eingeordnet sind, verknüpft ist⁽¹²²⁾, und dies übrigens so, daß das Verheißungsgut als vor "uns" noch nicht wirklich erlangt gilt (11,13.39f; vgl. 4,1; 6,12). Auf der anderen Seite ist bei der Aktualisierung der Ansage offenbar nicht zuletzt an einen Eidschwur zu denken; denn ein solcher, der von Ps 109(110),4 nämlich, wird in 7,21 angeführt und in 7,28 — ähnlich der chronologischen Angabe von 4,7 — von der mosaischen Zeit, genauer: vom νόμος, abgesetzt und hat es dem Zusammenhang nach mit "besseren Verheißungen" (8,6) zu tun⁽¹²³⁾. Es wird deshalb wohl gefolgert werden dürfen: Die verheißende Ansage Gottes ergeht nach dem Hebräerbrief, in dem auch durch 6,17f eben dieser Gedanke zum Ausdruck gebracht werden dürfte⁽¹²⁴⁾, zunächst im frühen Israel und wird dann im alttestamentlichen Bereich später so aktualisiert, "daß wir einen starken Trost haben" (6,18). Hat man dabei als Beleg für solche Aktualisierung auch zuerst Ps 109(110),4 zu nennen, so wird man, auch wegen des gemeinsamen Bezugs auf "uns", natürlich weiter Ps 94(95),7(-11), vor allem aber noch das Wort Jer 38(31),31-34 einzubeziehen haben⁽¹²⁵⁾, das erstmals im Anschluß an die Formulierung von den "besseren Verheißungen" (8,6), nämlich in 8,8-12, zitiert wird, darüber hinaus auszugsweise auch in 10,16f. Zumal, wie schon erwähnt⁽¹²⁶⁾, der auctor ad Hebraeos in Ps 109(110),4 und Jer 38(31),31-34 Gott als κύριος benannt sein und sprechen läßt, werden gerade auch diese Zitationen und ihr Kontext als Interpretation des λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου von 2,3 aufgefaßt werden müssen.

(122) Abraham (6,13.15; 7,6; 11,9.17; vgl. 6,12) und Sara (11,11), Isaak und Jakob (11,9), die Nachkommen Abrahams oder, weniger wahrscheinlich (s. zum Problem nur MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 397), die frühen der πρεσβύτεροι von 11,2 (11,13), dieser Kreis insgesamt (11,39). (Sozusagen neutestamentlicher Gebrauch: 4,1; 6,17; 8,6; 9,15; 10,23.36.)

(123) Es mag gut sein, daß von hier aus, und damit gerade auch von Moses Schauen der himmlischen σκηνή (8,5; vgl. 11,27) aus, die o. Anm. 116 diskutierte schwierige Formulierung 3,5b zu verstehen ist. Dies ist jedenfalls der Ansatz von D'ANGELO, *Moses*, passim.

(124) Daß bei dem als zweites πᾶγμα neben die Verheißung tretenden Eid (s. dazu BRAUN, *Hebräer*, 189) weniger an 6,13f und Gen 22,16f, jedenfalls mindestens auch schon an 7,20f und Ps 109(110),4 zu denken ist, wird zwar von MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 252, unter Hinweis auf den Zusammenhang bestritten, aber durch eine erhebliche Anzahl von Exegeten verfochten (s. nur ebd. Anm. 6). Und was den Kontext angeht, so findet das Wir von 6,18 nicht in 6,13f, jedoch in 7,19.26 Entsprechungen.

(125) Vgl. das o. bei, nach Anm. 91 Gesagte.

(126) Und zwar o. (bei) Anm. 37-39.

(2) Die Passage 2,1-4 dürfte nicht nur im ersten Hauptteil des Briefs (mit 3,7-4,11) eine Entsprechung finden, sondern auch in den folgenden, und zwar mit 10,26-30 und 12,18-28⁽¹²⁷⁾. Diese zwei, wieder durch den Schluß a minore ad maius⁽¹²⁸⁾ bestimmten Textsegmente gehören insofern enger mit 3,7-4,11 als mit 2,1-4 zusammen, als sie nicht nur jeweils einer warnenden Sentenz in der Art von 4,12f vorangehen⁽¹²⁹⁾, sondern als bei ihnen auch beidemale das zweite Element der “logischen” Figur explizit auf Jesus Bezug nimmt (10,29; 12,24; vgl. 12,28). Um so auffälliger ist, daß hier wie dort (genauer: in 10,30 und sehr wahrscheinlich⁽¹³⁰⁾ auch in 12,25f) allein Gottes Reden im Blick ist. Selbstverständlich bestätigt dieser Tatbestand unsere Einschätzung von 2,3f nachdrücklich. Sie wird im übrigen keineswegs dadurch gefährdet, daß beide Textsegmente es anders als 3,7-4,11 und ähnlich wie 2,1-4 in ihrem ersten Element mit dem Gesetz bzw. der Gesetzgebung zu tun haben (10,28; 12,18-21); vielmehr ist deutlich, daß 2,1-4 (Gesetz/Propheten) und 3,7-4,11 (Propheten/Jesus) im ersten Hauptteil des Schreibens zusammen dieselbe Gegenüberstellung, also: Gesetz/Jesus (und Gott), ergeben, wie sie jene Textsegmente in den nachfolgenden Partien des Briefs je für sich zum Ausdruck bringen. Aber die bezeichnete Differenz deutet doch unterschiedliche Akzentuierungen an: Während die Gegenüberstellung von Sinai und Zion in 12,18-28 abschließend und summierend beides, Größe des Heils und der Gefährdung, vor Augen führt, ist in 10,26-30, schon angesichts des Verweises auf die tödlichen Folgen von Gesetzesübertretung (10,28), fraglos die Warnung dominant⁽¹³¹⁾; daß eine Gefährdung der christlichen Gemeinde überhaupt in Betracht kommt, ist nicht gut anhand des Gesetzes als einer nach dem Verfasser in gewisser Hinsicht vorläufigen Einrichtung (vgl. nur 7,18f) zu demonstrieren, sondern wird in 3,7-4,11 mit dem Exempel der Wüstengeneration gezeigt, welcher das Wort

⁽¹²⁷⁾ Vgl. K. BERGER, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg 1984) 159f.

⁽¹²⁸⁾ Vgl. zu ihm o. (bei) Anm. 98.

⁽¹²⁹⁾ HOFIUS, *Katapausis*, Anm. 935 (zu 150), nimmt diesen Sachverhalt als ein Indiz dafür, daß neben 1,1-4,13 auch 4,14-10,31 und ebenso 10,32-12,29 als Hauptteil des Hebräerbriefts zu werten ist.

⁽¹³⁰⁾ S. dazu nur MICHEL, *Hebräer*, 471, und RISSI, *Theologie*, 30.

⁽¹³¹⁾ Nach dem, was (o. bei Anm. 24-30, 43f, 85-96) hinsichtlich der “Festigung” und des Mitbezeugens von 2,2-4 zu beobachten war, darf vielleicht erwogen werden, ob den “zwei oder drei Zeugen” von 10,28 nicht im zweiten Element des Schlusses a minore ad maius die beiden Schriftworte von 10,30 eben als doppeltes *Schriftzeugnis* korrespondieren.

des Heils schon galt, die das damit gegebene Ziel aber dennoch verfehlte (vgl. nochmals 4,1f). Der Passus 2,1-4 endlich impliziert ansatzweise schon alle diese dann unterschiedlich akzentuiert hervortretenden Momente und erfüllt überdies eine wichtige Funktion damit, daß er die Adressaten des Hebräerbriefs sich als so etwas wie die endzeitlichen Adressaten des Redens des Kyrios, Gottes selbst, "in den Propheten" (1,1) begreifen läßt. Das hat in 2,1-4 und im übrigen Schreiben Konsequenzen für die Paränese, hat aber auch noch darüber hinaus Konsequenzen für die Rezeption der Argumentation des Briefs⁽¹³²⁾.

Wagensteigstr. 15
D-7811 St. Märgen

Michael BACHMANN

SOMMAIRE

L'article montre que l'expression *dia tou kyriou* d'He 2,3 s'applique à Dieu et non à Jésus, comme on l'interprète habituellement. Disparaissent ainsi nombre de difficultés. Si l'on comprend 2,3 comme le discours prophétique de Dieu dans le temps de l'AT, les questions de structure deviennent en outre plus claires, en particulier la composition en miroir de 2,1-4 et le fait que ces versets font pendant à 3,7-4,11, également la correspondance de ces deux blocs avec 10,26-30 et 12,18-28. La thèse de l'article n'est en rien menacée par des "parallèles" comme Mc 16,20, car la mention des miracles en He 2,4 et la tradition représentée en 2,3-4 sont à rattacher à des contextes vétérotestamentaires (cf. He 3,9s; 10,15; Ex 7,3).

⁽¹³²⁾ So die, daß mit dem gewonnenen Verständnis von 2,3 gleichzeitig das einzige wichtige Argument auf synchroner Ebene dafür hinfällt, bei 6,1 im Sinne eines genitivus subiectivus auf das Wort, das Christus selbst sprach, zu deuten. Auch der nähere Kontext, in dem etwa die Bezüge von 5,12f und 6,5 auf 6,1 nicht eben leicht bestreitbar sein dürften, macht es ja, wie o. Anm. 8 schon angedeutet, alles andere als leicht, 6,1f vom Reden Jesu zu verstehen. Im Blick auf den Gegenstand christlicher Lehre macht unser Autor nicht das Reden Jesu, sondern die *λόγια* bzw. den *λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* (5,12; 13,7; vgl. 5,13; 6,5) namhaft.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Les six dons du Saint-Esprit La version hiéronymienne d'Isaïe 11,2.3

Le chapitre 11 d'Isaïe annonce l'avènement d'un roi idéal, de souche davidique, sur qui reposera l'esprit du Seigneur. Le v. 2 énumère les dons de l'esprit dont il sera comblé, groupés en trois paires: esprit de sagesse et d'intelligence (*rûah hokemâ ûbinâ*), esprit de conseil et de force (*rûah 'êšâ ûgêbûrâ*), esprit de science et de crainte du Seigneur (*rûah da'at w'eyir'at yhw*). Un ajout en tête du v. 3 insiste sur le fait qu'il sera pénétré de la crainte du Seigneur (*wahârîhō b'eyir'at yhw*). Les commentaires sont partagés quant à l'origine de cet ajout: dittographie ou interpolation? Le sens du verbe *wahârîhō* fait problème; les traducteurs anciens ont lu et compris de différentes manières; les critiques modernes ont suggéré des corrections, dont aucune ne s'impose. Pour notre propos, ces points sont sans importance. Ce qui importe, c'est que la Septante a traduit *yir'at yhw* de deux manières différentes: εὐσεβεία au v. 2, φόβος θεοῦ au v. 3: ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως, πνεῦμα βουλήs καὶ ἰσχυρός, πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας· ἐμπλήσει αὐτὸν πνεῦμα φόβου θεοῦ. Les deux traductions peuvent se justifier, car le sentiment religieux désigné par εὐσεβεία dans la tradition hellénique est assez proche de la «crainte de Dieu» biblique⁽¹⁾. Cependant, la Septante distinguait ainsi sept dons là où l'hébreu n'en énumérait que six. Ce faisant, elle ouvrait la voie à la doctrine des sept dons du Saint-Esprit, qui a connu un grand développement à l'époque patristique⁽²⁾.

*
* *

Il est communément admis que Jérôme, dans ce passage célèbre et abondamment cité, n'a pas osé s'écarter du texte reçu en milieu chrétien, lorsqu'il a traduit le livre d'Isaïe d'après l'hébreu⁽³⁾. De fait, tous les ma-

⁽¹⁾ I. L. SEELIGMANN, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden 1948) 103.

⁽²⁾ K. SCHLÜTZ, *Isaias 11,2 (die sieben Gaben des hl. Geistes) in den Ersten Vier Christlichen Jahrhunderten* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 11,4; Münster i.W. 1932).

⁽³⁾ Voir p. ex. Fr. STUMMER, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn 1928) 100: «Offenbar hat er an dieser den Gläubigen vertrauten Stelle nichts ändern wollen».

nuscripts de la version hiéronymienne, autant que nous sachions, offrent un texte semblable à celui des anciennes versions latines⁽⁴⁾, et donc à la Septante: «Requiescet super eum spiritus domini, spiritus sapientiae et intellectus, spiritus consilii et fortitudinis, spiritus scientiae et pietatis, et replebit eum spiritus timoris domini».

En préparant l'édition de la *Vetus latina* d'Isaïe, nous avons eu cependant l'attention attirée par le fait qu'un lectionnaire du VIII^e s. reproduisait la version hiéronymienne d'Is 11,1-10 avec, au v. 2, une variante conforme à l'hébreu; au lieu de *spiritus scientiae et pietatis*, ce témoin lit, en effet, *spiritus scientiae et timoris domini*, puis enchaîne, au v. 3, et replevit eum spiritus timoris domini. Il s'agit du lectionnaire de Sélestat (Bibl. munic., 1)⁽⁵⁾, qui conserve, abstraction faite de variantes accidentelles banales, un excellent texte d'Isaïe. Dans bien des cas où la grande majorité de la tradition directe a suivi la pente de la facilité, il figure parmi les rares témoins qui sont restés fidèles à l'original, p. ex. Is 6,3 *dominus* avec Δ^MAR (tous les autres ajoutent *deus*); *plena* avec CXΔ^MΘ^{G2} (tous les autres ajoutent *est*); 9,3 *exultant* avec AOΦ^{RG}Θ^H*SQ1 (tous les autres ajoutent *victores*, suivi ou non de *capta praeda*); 11,3 *renis* avec AΘ^{HS}*vid1 (tous les autres lisent *renum*); 53,11 *servus meus multos* avec Θ^H*R*Γ^AΩ (*servos meus multus* U; tous les autres portent *servos meos multos*). Il arrive même qu'il soit absolument seul à conserver des leçons difficiles, mais correspondant exactement à l'hébreu, qui sont appuyées par l'*In Esaiam* de Jérôme et par des citations patristiques, et qui sont à juste titre préférées par les auteurs de l'édition bénédictine. C'est le cas notamment en Is 6,2, où il faut lire: «Seraphim stabant super illud, sex alae uni et sex alae alteri; duabus velabat faciem eius et duabus velabat pedes eius et duabus volabat, et clamabat alter ad alterum et dicebat: Sanctus, etc.». En hébreu, les verbes *velabat*, *velabat*, *volabat*, *clamabat*, *dicebat* sont au singulier. Il en va de même en latin dans le commentaire de Jérôme, ainsi que dans une citation d'Eucher de Lyon⁽⁶⁾. En revanche, tous les manuscrits de la Vulgate écrivent à deux reprises *velabant*; seul le *Floriacensis* porte *volabat* au singulier; une petite minorité lit *clamabat* (AOΦ^{RG}Θ^{M2}G²), puis *dicebat* (XΔ^MΦ^ΘG²); le lectionnaire de Sélestat est l'unique témoin qui a les cinq verbes au singulier. Ces faits dissuadent d'écarter de prime abord la leçon de ce manuscrit en Is 11,2 comme une simple faute de plume.

Un autre manuscrit liturgique présente une variante curieuse au même endroit; il s'agit du ms. Verona, B. C. LXXXVIII (83), qui lit *spiritus scientiae et veritatis* au lieu de *spiritus scientiae et pietatis*. Le copiste de ce lectionnaire véronais du IX^e s. ne l'a probablement pas inventée. Elle apparaît

⁽⁴⁾ Les anciennes versions latines sont ici très semblables; quelques rares témoins se singularisent par un vocabulaire ou un ordre des mots particulier. Voir notre édition (*Vetus Latina 12: Isaias*, Freiburg 1987 et suiv.), dont le fascicule 5, qui contiendra ce passage, est sous presse au moment où nous écrivons ces lignes.

⁽⁵⁾ Voir G. MORIN, «Le lectionnaire mérovingien de Schlettstadt et son texte occidental des Actes», *Etudes, textes, découvertes*, I (Maredsous 1913) 440-456.

⁽⁶⁾ Voir *Vetus Latina 12: Isaias*, 189, 191, 196-197; nous suivons les meilleurs manuscrits du commentaire.

déjà chez Eucher de Lyon et dans le *Decretum Gelasianum*⁽⁷⁾. Son origine n'est pas difficile à découvrir; elle provient du discours après la cène, dans lequel il est question à trois reprises de l'«esprit de vérité»⁽⁸⁾. Mais on ne voit pas pourquoi l'esprit de vérité aurait été substitué à l'esprit de piété. La variante s'explique mieux à partir d'un texte semblable à celui du lectionnaire de Sélestat; pour éviter une répétition qui lui apparaissait incongrue, et reconstituer un septénaire, son auteur a recouru à la première formule que lui offrait sa mémoire⁽⁹⁾.

Une autre anomalie apparaît chez Fauste de Riez, dans lequel l'énumération des dons du Saint-Esprit se limite à six termes: «Legimus in Esaia super dominum Iesum descendisse spiritum domini, spiritum sapientiae et intellectus, spiritum consilii et fortitudinis, spiritum scientiae et pietatis; de hoc itaque spiritu domini, etc.»⁽¹⁰⁾. Ce n'est pas le sixième don qui fait problème ici, mais l'absence du septième. Or, Fauste de Riez, comme Casien, comme Eucher de Lyon, connaît et utilise couramment la version hiéronymienne d'Isaïe, qui s'est diffusée en Gaule méridionale dès les années 420, à partir de Marseille et de Lérins. La piété n'a-t-elle pas été substituée à la crainte du Seigneur, sous l'influence de la vieille latine, dans une énumération conforme à l'hébreu, qui se bornait à six dons?

Jérôme lui-même énumère les dons du Saint-Esprit dans le «Livre des onze questions», adressé en 407 à une correspondante de la région bordelaise, Algasia, qui lui avait soumis différentes questions d'exégèse. Dans le plus ancien manuscrit, copié à Bobbio vers 600, l'énumération comporte seulement les six dons mentionnés dans l'hébreu au v. 2: «Posuit quoque spiritum suum super eum, spiritum sapientiae et intelligentiae, spiritum consilii et fortitudinis, spiritum scientiae et timoris dei, qui in specie columbae descendit super eum»⁽¹¹⁾. Il est normal que Jérôme s'en tienne ici à l'hébreu⁽¹²⁾, car il plaide dans le contexte en faveur de l'hébreu, contre la Septante. Mais dans les manuscrits carolingiens et postérieurs, que suivent naturellement les éditeurs, la piété a été rajoutée à sa place habituelle.

Le «Livre des onze questions» est contemporain des premiers livres du commentaire de Jérôme sur Isaïe, dans lequel se trouvent expliqués les versets qui nous occupent. Ce commentaire fournit la confirmation décisive de ce que les indices rassemblés jusqu'à présent ont été correctement interprétés, et va nous permettre de nouer en preuve ce qui n'est encore qu'un fais-

(7) Eucher de Lyon, *Instructiones*, 1 (CSEL 31, 139); *Decretum Gelasianum*, 1 (TU 38/4, 4).

(8) Jn 14,17; 15,26; 16,13.

(9) Nous avons fait l'expérience de demander à des collègues et à des étudiants en théologie d'énumérer, si possible dans l'ordre, les dons du Saint-Esprit. Bien peu en ont été capables. Parmi les réponses étrangères à l'énumération d'Isaïe, la plus fréquente était «l'esprit de vérité».

(10) Fauste de Riez, *De spiritu sancto*, 1, 7 (CSEL 21, 111).

(11) Jérôme, *Epist.* 121, 2, 9 (CSEL 56, 10).

(12) Contrairement à ce qu'on pourrait croire, Jérôme ne cite que rarement sa propre traduction de l'Ancien Testament. D'habitude, il cite l'ancienne version latine qu'il a en mémoire. C'est aussi le cas pour Is 11,2.3. Voir l'édition citée ci-dessus, n. 4.

ceau de présomptions. A lire les éditions⁽¹³⁾, le texte expliqué par Jérôme serait mot pour mot celui des manuscrits de la Vulgate, qui énumèrent les sept dons du Saint-Esprit suivant la Septante. Quand on prend la peine de consulter les manuscrits du commentaire, on constate que ce n'est pas le cas. Etant donné que ces manuscrits sont fort nombreux, nous nous bornons aux plus anciens, qui datent des VIII^e et IX^e s. En voici la liste.

- A* Paris, B. N., lat. 1815 (fin du IX^e s.)
- B* Brescia, Bibl. civica Queriniana, A. III. 14 (VIII^e s.)
- Bo* Roma, Bibl. apost. Vatic., lat. 5761 (début du IX^e s.)
- C* Paris, B. N., lat. 11627 (deuxième moitié du VIII^e s.)
- F* München, Bayerische Staatsbibl., Clm 6270a (première moitié du IX^e s.)
- G* Sankt-Gallen, Stiftsbibl., 113 (820-830)
- H* Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibl., 125 (deuxième moitié du IX^e s.)
- K* Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibl., Aug. CLXXXI (fin du VIII^e s.)
- La* Roma, Bibl. apost. Vatic., Pal. lat. 172 (première moitié du IX^e s.)
- Lu* Lyon, Bibl. munic., 466 (VIII^e/IX^e s.)
- O* Orléans, Bibl. munic., 58 (55) (première moitié du IX^e s.)
- Ox* Oxford, Bodleian Libr., Laud. misc. 455 (première moitié du IX^e s.)
- P* Paris, B. N., lat. 1809 (troisième quart du IX^e s.)
- R* Reims, Bibl. munic., 75 (IX^e s.)
- S* Salzburg, Stiftsbibl. St. Peter, a. X. 22 (VIII^e/IX^e s.)
- T* Tours, Bibl. munic., 273 (IX^e s.)
- V* Roma, Bibl. apost. Vatic., lat. 321 (deuxième quart du IX^e s.)
- Ve* Vercelli, Bibl. capitolare, CIX (55) (deuxième moitié du IX^e s.)

Parmi ces dix-huit manuscrits, trois, à savoir *P*, *V* et *Ve*, présentent au lemme un texte semblable à celui du lectionnaire de Sélestat, c'est-à-dire un texte où le sixième don, au v. 2, est la crainte du Seigneur, dont il est fait mention une seconde fois au v. 3a, comme en hébreu; les autres manuscrits sont conformes au texte reçu de la Vulgate. Ce seul fait est déjà significatif; si le texte conforme à l'hébreu n'est pas l'original, on ne s'explique pas comment trois témoins indépendants l'auraient engendré séparément, sans qu'intervienne aucune des causes habituelles d'accidents de copie. En outre, ces trois témoins méritent un crédit particulier⁽¹⁴⁾. Le manuscrit *P* a été copié directement sur un modèle remontant à l'antiquité tardive. *V* transmet souvent des leçons anciennes là où la majorité de la tradition est corrom-

⁽¹³⁾ Les principales éditions de l'*In Esaiam* sont celles d'Erasme (1516), Marianus Victorius (1623), Martianay (1704) et Vallarsi (1735). C'est cette dernière qui est réimprimée au t. XXIV de la Patrologie latine de Migne. L'édition de M. Adriaen (CChr LXXIII-LXXIIIA) n'est pas une véritable édition critique; elle se borne à amender occasionnellement, et pas toujours de façon heureuse, le texte des éditions du XVIII^e s.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Voir R. GRYSON - P. A. DEPROOST, «La tradition manuscrite du commentaire de Jérôme sur Isaïe: livres I et II», *Scriptorium* 43 (1989). Au livre IV, où est expliqué le texte qui nous occupe, les rapports entre les manuscrits sont pratiquement les mêmes, à ceci près que *H* et *Ve* ne sont plus apparentés à *B*.

pue, ainsi que des particularités éditoriales (signes diacritiques, intertitres, etc.) qui ont disparu dans la plupart des témoins. *Ve*, conservé dans une des plus vénérables bibliothèques ecclésiastiques d'Italie, offre aux livres III et IV un texte de grande qualité. Enfin, le commentaire du texte litigieux fournit, comme souvent en pareil cas, un argument sans réplique. A trois reprises, la masse des manuscrits, et non plus seulement quelques bons témoins, atteste que Jérôme, dans le texte qu'il avait sous les yeux, ne trouvait mentionnés que six dons de l'esprit; la crainte du Seigneur clôturerait l'énumération du v. 2, dont la piété est absente. Le v. 3a insiste ensuite plus particulièrement sur la crainte du Seigneur. Voici ce passage tel qu'il se lit dans la plupart des manuscrits, avec entre parenthèses les variantes des témoins divergents.

Quomodo idem sermo dei vocatur lux et vita et resurrectio, sic spiritus sapientiae et intellectus et consilii et fortitudinis et scientiae (+ et pietatis *post corr. CFLuS*) ac timoris domini nuncupatur, non quod diversus sit iuxta differentias nominum, sed unus atque idem cunctarum virtutum fons sit atque principium. Absque Christo igitur nec sapiens quis esse potest nec intellegens nec consiliarius nec fortis nec eruditus (+ nec pius *post corr. CLuOx*) nec plenus timoris domini. Et hoc notandum quod spiritus domini, sapientiae et intellectus, consilii et fortitudinis et scientiae (+ et pietatis *BKLaLu*, et *post corr. ACGOx*) et timoris domini, id est septenarius numerus, qui septem oculi in uno lapide dicuntur in Zacharia (cf. Za 3,9), requiescat super virgam et florem qui de Iesse ac per hoc David stirpe surrexit, specialiter autem spiritus timoris domini impleverit eum propter eos qui timore domini indigent, quia parvuli sunt⁽¹⁵⁾.

Il est clair que dans les trois cas, la mention de la piété constitue un ajout, et que les éditeurs, qui sont unanimes à le reproduire, ont fait indûment confiance à des manuscrits tardifs ou corrigés à mauvais escient. L'attestation un peu plus fournie dans le dernier cas ne doit pas faire impression; les quatre témoins qui portent la variante de première main ne sont pas indépendants; le plus ancien (*B*) l'a léguée aux trois autres. La remarque qui suit l'énumération, *id est septenarius numerus*, ne cautionne en aucune façon le texte vulgarisé par les éditeurs. Jérôme démarque probablement ici Origène ou Didyme⁽¹⁶⁾. Dans son commentaire sur Zacharie, ce dernier explique précisément Za 3,9 à l'aide d'Is 11,2.3⁽¹⁷⁾. Il doit ce rapprochement à une tradition exégétique très ancienne, d'origine judéo-chrétienne, qui est indépendante du texte des Septante; on la retrouve chez Aphraate, qui cite la Peshitta, conforme à l'hébreu, et qui arrive au chiffre sept, évocateur de

⁽¹⁵⁾ Jérôme, *In Esaïam*, 4 (CChr 73, 148-149).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Sur les sources de l'*In Esaïam*, voir R. GRYSO – D. SZMATULA, « Les commentaires patristiques sur Isaïe d'Origène à Jérôme », à paraître dans *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 24 (1990) n° 1.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Didyme l'Aveugle, *In Zachariam*, 1, 254-257 (SC 83, 324-327).

plénitude, en comptant comme Jérôme les sept génitifs énumérés à la suite: *spiritus domini, sapientiae et intellectus, consilii et fortitudinis, scientiae et timoris domini*⁽¹⁸⁾; Jérôme ne parle pas de «sept dons», mais seulement d'un *septenarius numerus*. Selon certains commentateurs, cette signification symbolique du nombre sept était déjà présente à l'esprit du poète hébreu qui composa ce texte⁽¹⁹⁾.

*
* * *

Contrairement à ce qu'on affirme communément sur la foi des éditions imprimées, qui dépendent elles-mêmes de manuscrits corrompus, Jérôme, lorsqu'il a traduit le livre d'Isaïe d'après l'hébreu, énumère seulement six dons du Saint-Esprit, alors que les Pères grecs et latins, se fondant sur la Septante, en comptaient sept. Mais le don manquant a eu tôt fait de réapparaître sous la pression de l'usage, dès que l'on a commencé à recopier sa traduction.

Cet exemple fait voir, après d'autres⁽²⁰⁾, que la tradition directe des écrits bibliques ne mérite qu'une confiance limitée. Dans ce domaine où les manuscrits abondent et où les enjeux théologiques ne sont pas sans influence sur les copistes, le texte révisé chasse le texte ancien comme la mauvaise monnaie chasse la bonne. Il faut aller chercher celle-ci dans le trésor souvent méconnu de la tradition indirecte.

Université catholique de Louvain
Grand-Place, 45
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve

Roger GRYSOY

⁽¹⁸⁾ Voir SCHLÜTZ, *Isaïas 11,2*, 33-36.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Voir J. TOUZARD, «Isaïe XI, 2-3 et les sept dons du Saint-Esprit», *RB* 8 (1899) 250; A. VACCARI, «Spiritus septiformis ex Isaia 11,2», *Verbum Domini* 11 (1931) 129-133.

⁽²⁰⁾ Voir nos articles «La vieille-latine, témoin privilégié du texte du Nouveau Testament. L'exemple de Matthieu 13,13-15», *RTL* 19 (1988) 413-432; «Barachie et la prophétesse. Exercice de critique textuelle sur Isaïe 8,2.3», *RB* 96 (1989) 321-333; «La version gotique des évangiles. Essai de réévaluation», *RTL* 21 (1990) 3-31.

Dreams and Prophetic Visions

As demonstrated by A. Jepsen⁽¹⁾, the vision in Hebrew literature is usually ascribed to prophets. We may go beyond this to say that dreams are not ascribed to prophets except in denigration. However, this assertion goes contrary to many standard reference works which equate dreams and night visions⁽²⁾, and thus we must elaborate. It should be made clear that the question at hand is one of terminology, not phenomenology. We are not interested here in the actual phenomenon of revelatory experiences, which are largely unrecoverable, but rather how revelatory experiences were perceived and classed in the vocabulary of the writers.

Dreams and Visions

We must first recognize the absence of that which is not there. The identification of prophetic visions and dreams is quite rare, occurring only three times in the prose material of the MT⁽³⁾. The three occurrences are Dan 7,1, Jer 23,25-28 and Num 12,6-8. Note that the latter two cases are polemics against the prophets who are described. In Jeremiah the false prophets are quoted as saying "I have dreamed! I have dreamed!", clearly a taunt⁽⁴⁾. In verse 28 the dream is clearly contrasted with the real word of the Lord. Thus in Jeremiah 23 the dream is not an acceptable mode of revelation for a prophet, and the revelations of false prophets are called dreams in contrast to the word of the Lord. This attitude toward dreams is reinforced in Jer 27,9 and 29,8. Likewise in Zech 10,2 those who use dreams as divine revelations are classed with diviners and teraphim users as false leaders who leave the people to wander.

In Numbers 12 Miriam and Aaron rebel against the authority of Moses, pointing out that God had spoken to them as well. It is in this context that prophetic revelations are termed visions and dreams. The contrast is made between these revelations and the more direct revelations to Moses, denigrating the prophetic office of Miriam and Aaron. It is not

⁽¹⁾ *TDOT* 4, 280-290.

⁽²⁾ E.g. M. OTTOSON, *TDOT* 4, 427; I. MENDELSON, *IDB* 1, 868; J.H. STECK, *ISBE* 1, 992.

⁽³⁾ For lexical studies Hebrew poetry is often deceptive as it is common for poets to link terms which would normally remain distinct in prose (e.g. "milk" and "curds/butter" in Judg 5,25, cf. 4,19. Also Job 39,1 "goats" and "hinds", note that vv. 2-4 indicate one species is the subject.). Thus such texts as Joel 2,28 (3,1) and Job 33,15 provide poor proof of identity between dreams and prophetic visions.

⁽⁴⁾ J. BRIGHT, *Jeremiah* (AB 21; Garden City 1965) 153, comm. on v.28; J.A. THOMPSON, *The Book of Jeremiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1980) 500-501.

necessary to equate dreams and prophetic visions in order to understand this passage. Both are described as significantly lower forms of revelation compared with how God spoke with Moses.

In Deut 13,1.3.5 prophets are listed with dreamers of dreams, but are connected with the contrastive conjunction 'w ("or"). The text does not detail the differences between prophets and dreamers, but it does distinguish them.

Nocturnal Revelations

It is nocturnal prophetic revelations which scholars often term dreams, usually without textual support. Nocturnal revelations tend to be described with a minimum of technical terminology, and "dream" is not one of the terms. In 1 Sam 3,3-18 and 2 Sam 7,4 the revelatory experiences receive no specific term. Though not an Israelite, Balaam is treated as a prophet of the Lord in Numbers 22, and his nocturnal revelatory experiences are not called dreams (22,8-13.19-21).

"Vision(s) of the night" is a term used especially in Daniel 2 and 7 for the prophet's nocturnal revelations. In Daniel 2 the contrast is sharp between Daniel's vision and the king's dream. Eighteen times in the chapter the king's experience is called a dream using both the noun and verb *hlm*, but Daniel's nocturnal revelation containing the same content with an interpretation is called a "vision of the night". The terminology is carefully distinct.

Dan 7,1 stands out in strong contrast to the pattern we have observed thus far and shows signs of being a late addition to the vision and the book. Nowhere else in this chapter are Daniel's night visions described as a dream, and the terminology of 7,1 is borrowed from 2,28 and 4,5(2).10(8). 13(11)⁽⁵⁾. As there are no other datelines in the Aramaic of Daniel, this dateline introduction was probably added to conform the Aramaic vision to the Hebrew visions (8,1; 9,1; 10,1).

Special Cases

An interesting case is Solomon's dream of 1 Kgs 3,5.15 contrasted with 2 Chr 1,7. In 1 Kings the revelation is clearly labeled a dream, but this designation is left out in 2 Chronicles, though the fact that this revelation occurred at night is retained⁽⁶⁾. Myers does not see this event as a vision in Chronicles, but rather a direct visitation. In Chronicles Solomon holds a higher status than in Kings, which may account for the more direct form of revelation, though Coggins explains the omission of any reference to dreams by noting the denigration of Jer 23,25-32 and suggesting that the decline in status of dreams was a recent development.

⁽⁵⁾ For Dan 7,15 where the vision is described as "visions of my head" (cf. 7,1) rather than "visions of the night" (7,2.7.13), the Old Greek translation reads "visions of the night" here in all witnesses.

⁽⁶⁾ J. M. MYERS, *II Chronicles* (AB 13; Garden City 1965) 6; R. J. COGGINS, *The First and Second Books of Chronicles* (New York 1976) 148.

The patriarchs of Genesis provide us with an interesting case in that the text indicates a prophetic level of inspiration for the patriarchs⁽⁷⁾. Throughout the book Abraham, Isaac and Rebekkah never receive revelations through dreams. In one case Abraham is spoken of as being in a deep sleep (*tardemah*), yet the revelation is not called a dream (15,12). In contrast, God communicated with Abimelek by a dream (20,3.6)⁽⁸⁾.

Jacob is the first of the patriarchs to receive revelations through dreams (28,12-15; 31,10-13). Note that in the second case the revelation is initiated when Jacob "lifted his eyes", terminology usually reserved for prophetic visions. However, Jacob's status changes when he wrestles with the angel at Penue! in chapter 32 and his name is changed. Henceforth Jacob's revelations are no longer called dreams (35,1.9-12; 46,2-4). It seems that with the renaming at Penue! Jacob entered into the full status of patriarch. Apparently Joseph never attained to this status for we read only of his dreams (37,5-10). However, in the generation of Joseph the promise of Abraham's inheritance is divided among all twelve sons of Jacob, leaving no single patriarch of the covenant.

Hellenistic Literature

The consistency of the Hebrew canon in general, and of Daniel in particular, concerning dreams and prophetic visions must be understood in order to recognize the change which occurred in the Hellenistic period. Though some Hellenistic works retained the distinction between prophetic visions and dreams, many documents witness to a blurring of the distinction. A blatant example is found in 4QAmram frag. 1.10 in which Amram's vision is called "a vision, a dream vision" (*hzw y hzw h dy hlm'*). In Jubilees 14,1; 27,21 and 32,1 revelations to Abraham, Jacob and Levi are described as dreams.

In contrast, the corpus of 1 Enoch almost never ascribes a dream to Enoch. The one exception is in the so-called Book of Dream Visions, chapters 83-90. Four times in this section Enoch's nocturnal revelations are called visions, and once one is called a dream (85,1). Another interesting case is the Abram section of the Genesis Apocryphon, which is divided into a first-person pseudepigraphical narrative and a third-person narrative. In the first-person narrative Abram receives a dream revelation (XIX.14), but in the third-person narrative Abram receives a vision, not a dream (XXII.27). The change in person is probably due to a redaction of two sources, and reflects the difference in the two sources in either adherence to the terminology of Genesis or concepts of dreams and visions.

(7) The question of whether this also indicates a prophetic role goes beyond the scope of this paper. The terminology does not necessarily carry the full weight of any particular prophetic role, which may vary considerably.

(8) Ascribing chapter 20 to the E source and the other cases to J merely begs the question. Why was E used only for revelations to non-patriarchs and J only for revelations to patriarchs? If we are to accept the traditional concept of the redaction of Genesis we must also recognize certain traits of selection and adaptation used by the redactor.

Dan 7,1 uses terminology foreign to the rest of chapter 7 and at variance with the usages of dream and night vision in chapter 2. Whereas the bulk of Daniel references the prophet's nocturnal revelations as night visions in harmony with the rest of the Hebrew canon and the older Hebrew tradition, Dan 7,1, in calling Daniel's vision a dream, evidences a different tradition popular in the Hellenistic period and later. Thus Dan 7,1 was written for a community distinct from that responsible for the rest of the book, a similar distinction as for the two sources of the Abram section of the Genesis Apocryphon. Either the text of Daniel was in existence for a significant period of time during which the change took place before 7,1 was added, or the documents passed from one community which distinguished dreams and prophecy to another which did not.

Conclusion

Through distinction in terminology we have analyzed a distinction in attitude between dreams and prophetic visions in the Hebrew canon and the later dissolution of this distinction in the Hellenistic period. We must emphasize that this distinction is one of terminology and does not necessarily reflect a distinction in phenomenology. Neither does this distinction necessarily indicate a distinct role or office, but rather levels of revelation and authority.

1556 Simpson, # 7
Madison, WI 53713
USA

James E. MILLER

Did Peter Actually Fail to Get a Word in? (Acts 11,15)

In 1947, Martin Dibelius presented an essay as part of a festschrift to honor Anton Fridrichsen, an essay in which Dibelius considered the questions of historicity and sources as regards the Cornelius episode, Acts 10,1–11,18⁽¹⁾. Among the many observations and conclusions Dibelius made in this work was the claim that the speech of Peter to Christians of the Jerusalem community (Acts 11,5–17) was a secondary composition (by Luke⁽²⁾, not by his source). The basic method for determining the “secondariness” of this speech is a comparison of it to what is, at least for the moment⁽³⁾, taken by Dibelius to be the primary speech, i.e., Acts 10,34–43: to the degree that Peter’s speech in Jerusalem differs from his speech to Cornelius, to that degree one can justifiably claim that the later speech of Jerusalem was consciously composed as something distinct from the earlier speech at Caesarea — all for the author’s own purposes, which in Chapter 11 are different from those in Chapter 10. Dibelius, then, looks for differences between the two speeches; it is his *primary* (“vor allem aber”) difference that is noteworthy here:

Der Bericht des Petrus unterscheidet sich von der Erzählung in Kapitel 10 in verschiedenen Einzelheiten, vor allem aber in einem Punkt: der heilige Geist manifestiert sich... an allen heidnischen Zuhörern, nach 10,44 am Ende der Predigt des Petrus, nach 11,15 ‘als ich eben

⁽¹⁾ M. DIBELIUS, “Die Bekehrung des Cornelius”, *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* XI (Lund 1947) 50–65. This essay was reprinted, in English, as one of a number of Dibelius’ less available works in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed. H. GREEVEN) (London 1973) 109–122.

⁽²⁾ Dibelius claims that the two speeches of Peter (one to Cornelius, a second to the Jerusalem community) are “dem Schriftsteller zuzutrauen” (51).

⁽³⁾ Cf. K. HAACKER, “Dibelius und Cornelius”, *BZ* (24,2 N.F. 1980) 234–251, where Haacker, particularly in 236–239, digests and responds to Dibelius’ claims in *Coniectanea* about the relationships between the Petrine speeches of chapters 10 and 11, and of course tries to respond to Dibelius’ perceived contradiction, that Peter’s second speech suggests that he gave no first speech, but was interrupted by the descent of the Holy Spirit (HAACKER, “Dibelius”, 238–239). One of Haacker’s arguments is that Dibelius contradicts himself, for, to prove that the speech of Peter to Cornelius is a Lucan composition, Dibelius, according to Haacker, assumes Peter’s speech to the Jerusalem community as primary, but, when Dibelius treats of Peter’s speech to the Jerusalem community, Dibelius assumes the speech to Cornelius as primary. F.F. BRUCE, *Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Michigan 1981) 235, n.4, finds Dibelius weak at this point, too. For a full response to Haacker’s critique of Dibelius’ arguments about the historicity and sources of the major speeches in the Cornelius episode, cf. G. SCHNEIDER, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, II (Freiburg 1982) 62–64.

zu reden begonnen hatte'. Nach dem zweiten Bericht wäre also für die Rede des Petrus kein Platz⁽⁴⁾.

The argument of Dibelius concerning the timing of the Spirit's descent on Cornelius — *after* Peter had given a notable amount of discourse (10,34-43 and 44) or "*as* he began to speak" (11,15) — depends on his understanding of the clause: *en de tō arxasthai me lalein* (Acts 11,15). From his remarks just quoted, he clearly understands the clause to mean that Peter was just beginning to speak. Is his understanding of this clause correct? From various points of view there arises a convergence which suggests either that he is incorrect or ignoring a very reasonable alternative understanding of the clause. What are these points of view?

1. In the second volume of his multi-volume grammar, J. Moulton noted the popular use of the pleonastic sense of *archomai*⁽⁵⁾. He does not point to a relationship of this pleonastic sense of *archomai* to Acts 11,15. But later, F.F. Bruce, in commenting on 11,15, referred his reader to Moulton and remarked that "The idea of 'beginning' need not be pressed unduly.... In several places in the narrative portions of the NT, *archomai* is little more than a Semiticizing redundant auxiliary"⁽⁶⁾. I.H. Marshall seems to recognize Moulton's opinion (without formal mention) at 11,15:

A further difficulty has been seen in the fact that Peter says that the Holy Spirit fell on the audience 'as I began to speak', while in chapter 10 he has preached for some time before anything happens. But this too is merely an apparent difficulty. The point of Peter's statement here is simply that he had finished what he wanted to say, and the force of the verb 'begin' cannot be pressed in Hebraizing Greek⁽⁷⁾.

All the above remarks, then, help create a certain reluctance to interpret *arxasthai* in 11,15 as meaning Peter had "just begun to speak, when the Spirit descended".

⁽⁴⁾ DIBELIUS, "Die Bekehrung des Cornelius", 51.

⁽⁵⁾ J.H. MOULTON — W.F. HOWARD, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol.2: "Accidence and Word-Formation" (Edinburgh 1929), wherein Moulton notes among other things: "the Johannine *apokritheis kai eipen* is not the only example of a redundant verb in the indicative. The most striking example is *archomai*" (455), and Moulton goes on to cite specific passages of the Gospel of Luke and of the Acts of the Apostles where one finds *ērxato* + infinitive. Much of Moulton's concern about *ērxato* + infinitive had to do with the discussion of the time, whether or not this formula gave hint of an Aramaic substratum. His own judgment in this matter was: "I venture to add that its comparative frequency in the LXX may have inclined Luke to its use..." (455). It will be worth recalling this assessment when we consider further the LXX text Gen 2,2-3.

⁽⁶⁾ BRUCE, *Acts*, 285, n.13, where Bruce points the reader to Moulton for support of his comment.

⁽⁷⁾ I.H. MARSHALL, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Leicester 1980) 197. The appearance of the word "too" in the citation from Marshall indicates that Marshall is in his own way taking up the claims of Haenchen and answering them one by one (cf. E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles* [trans B. Noble, G. Shinn and R. McL. Wilson; Oxford, 1971] 355, who based himself on Dibelius).

2. James Kleist, in his grammar dealing with the way Mark used Greek terms, makes a sweeping statement for the entire New Testament concerning the particular use of *ērxato* with the infinitive: "Never merely 'he began'. It means through all Gk literature: 'he proceeded (to do)'"⁽⁸⁾. He then cites Mark 1,45, where, Kleist notes, it is not a question of Jesus's first moment of preaching, but of announcing that Jesus proceeded to preach, undertook to preach⁽⁹⁾.

Though Kleist does not speak of Acts 11,15, it is reasonable to conclude from his general premise that Acts 11,15 is to be understood, not to indicate the beginning moment of Peter's speech, but to say that Peter had entered upon his speech, when the Spirit descended. This point of view frees one from translating *arxasthai* as anything like "at the moment I began to speak..."⁽¹⁰⁾. It also takes one beyond the terminology of "pleonasm", to the realization that *en de tō arxasthai me lalein* can place one well into the speech already undertaken⁽¹¹⁾.

3. In his *Graecitas Biblica*, M. Zerwick says generally that the aorist infinitive of *archomai* in a subordinate clause indicates a time prior to the action of the main verb:

Si *en tō* cum infinitivo temporaliter adhibetur, infinitivus praesentis plerumque est de actione contemporanea, inf. aoristi plerumque de actione anteriore, non quasi tempus relativum exprimitur, sed quia infinitivus in eo genere actionis ponitur quod haberetur in propositione temporali, pro qua stat⁽¹²⁾.

One of his examples indicates his meaning: "*en tō proseuchesthai auton* 'orante eo' Lc 9,29; sed *egeneto en tō elthein auton eis oikon* 'cum intravis-

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. J. A. KLEIST, *The Gospel of Saint Mark* (Milwaukee 1935) 189, n.45: "*ērxato* w. pres. inf.; common in NT; never merely 'he began'. It means, throughout all Gk. literature, 'he proceeded to do,' with intention to continue. See Note I Joüon: 'il se met à proclamer'. *Memoirs* on 13,4". It is worthwhile to point out that Kleist's statement denies that *ērxato* + infinitive is at all a semitism, for it has the uniform meaning Kleist gives it "throughout Gk. literature". This does not mean, of course, that Luke did not want to reflect LXX usage in his use of this verb + infinitive. I thank Fr. John Welch, Professor of Greek at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, for drawing my attention to Kleist's statement about *ērxato*.

⁽⁹⁾ R. Funk notes, "*archesthai* in Mt, Mk, Lk is often used in an almost redundant way, as e.g. Mk 1:45 where *ērxato kēryssein* is hardly distinguishable from *ekēryssein*", in: F. BLASS - A. DEBRUNNER, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and ed. by R. Funk; Chicago 1962) 200, §392(2).

⁽¹⁰⁾ Quite contrary to this opinion is that of J. W. HUNKIN, "'Pleonastic' *archomai* in the New Testament", *JTS* (1924) 390-402. In regard to our 11,15 he notes, "Leaving aside i I for a moment, there is no reason in the other passages... to doubt a distinct sense of inception. Sometimes that sense is strong to the point of emphasis, e.g. xi 11,15..." (394). Our point is precisely whether or not the sense of inception is owed to the vocabulary or to a broader-based interpretation of how the articular infinitive clause fits with the rest of Peter's sentence.

⁽¹¹⁾ Kleist's understanding of the use of *ērxato* + infinitive does not deny that a speech, once undertaken, can be interrupted, but the use of *ērxato* (*arxasthai*) + infinitive of itself does not suggest interruption, or anything but the complete speech.

⁽¹²⁾ M. ZERWICK, *Graecitas Biblica* (Roma 1960) 123, §390.

set in domum'”(13). In general accord with Zerwick is R. Funk; Funk notes, when speaking about “a preposition with the dative of the articular infinitive”: “[After *en tō*] the present infinitive is normally used, but Lk also has the aorist, whereby the translation usually shifts from ‘while’ to ‘after that’ (therefore = aorist participle or *hote* with the aorist...)” (14).

If Zerwick's general statement be applied to Acts 11,15, the conclusion is that the *en tō* clause does not suggest contemporaneity of two actions, i.e., Peter's beginning to speak and the Spirit's descending. True, this argument from Zerwick's general statement about *en tō* clauses does not force one to say just when, once Peter had begun his speech, the Spirit descended, but it does force one to admit that the descent did not occur just as Peter began to speak (15). From this point of view, Peter would have started his speech before the Spirit descended; it would not be right to say that the Spirit descended “as Peter began to speak” (16).

4. There are examples in the Old Testament LXX which suggest that our *arxasthai* with the infinitive is nothing more than an alternative to a finite verb presentation (17). Let us look at one instance. At the very end of the first creation story, Genesis notes in a striking parallelism:

...*ho theos* ...*katepausen* ...*apo pantōn tōn ergōn autou, hōn epoiēsen* (Gen LXX 2,2).

...(*ho theos*) *katepausen apo pantōn tōn ergōn autou, hōn ērxato ho theos poiēsai* (Gen LXX 2,3) (18).

As one becomes aware of the role *archomai* (*ērxato*) + infinitive played in Septuagintal Greek, one cannot help but think that Luke, so often writing in the style of the Septuagint, was influenced by the Septuagint at 11,15. But particularly interesting about what we find at Gen LXX 2,3 is that what is written in Gen LXX 2,3 must be interpreted by what is written in Gen LXX 2,2 and not vice-versa. (Should not the same be done for 11,15 when compared with the Petrine speech in 10,34-43?)

5. A look at the text of Luke is instructive. Dibelius' interpretation of 11,15 as a ‘Widerspruch’ of 10,34-43 is to a great extent based on the fact of the *length* of the speech in 10,34-43: surely 181 words would never be summed up in the clause “as I began to speak”. But actually in the

(13) ZERWICK, *Graecitas*, 123, §390.

(14) FUNK, *Greek Grammar*, 208, §404(2); at this point Funk also shows Lucan exceptions to the general rule.

(15) J. DUPONT, *Nouvelles Etudes sur les Actes des Apôtres* (Lectio Divina 118; Paris 1984) 101, sums up Peter's description of part of his encounter with Cornelius: “Il (Peter) fait ensuite état ... de l'effusion de l'Esprit qui se produisit au moment où il commençait à parler” (11,15; cf. 10,44)”. “Au moment où” does not seem to capture the sense of *en tō*.

(16) One is reminded that Dibelius translated *en tō* as *als...eben...*; see note 4 above.

(17) For a few of the LXX examples of *archesthai* (*ērxato*) + *lalein*, see Gen 18,27; Exod 4,10; 1 Esd 4,1.13.33; Tob 8,5; 10,3.4 Job 6,4.

(18) I am grateful to Fr. John Welch for this example from the Septuagint.

Gospel of Luke we find that three lengthy speeches of Jesus are introduced by *ērxato* + infinitive of speaking (*legein*): 7,24 followed by c. 82 words; 12,1 followed by c. 212 words; 20,9 followed by c. 120 words. Apart from acknowledging the fact that *ērxato* in these Lucan examples does not point solely to the precise moment of beginning a speech, we must admit that *ērxato lalein* can suggest a speech as long as, or longer than the speech (10,34-43) to which Peter refers at 11,15. Length, then, should not weigh heavily in determining the sense of *en de tō arxasthai me lalein*.

In Acts itself, one faces the possibility of a pleonastic use of *ērxato* three times⁽¹⁹⁾: 1,1; 18,26; 24,2. Though the case in Acts 1,1 is still debated⁽²⁰⁾, the predominant opinion is that here there is a pleonasm, an opinion expressed in a rather full note by E. Haenchen⁽²¹⁾. The description of Apollos, however, seems very clear: 18,26 cannot mean that Priscilla and Aquila took Apollos aside “when he first opened his mouth to speak”; he can be presumed to have already said something, indeed a fair amount, before Priscilla and Aquila started him on his lessons. Further, the fact that Tertullus’ speech is introduced by *ērxato katēgorein... legōn* (24,2) is no impediment to the quotation of a full speech (of 84 words’ length). Thus, there are cases, clear cases, even in Acts itself which show that *ērxato lalein* need not mean at all “when he first begin to speak”.

6. A final word should include a consideration of what Acts 10,44 might add about the sense of *arxasthai* with the infinitive in 11,15. Many interpreters understand that Peter has given a complete speech to Cornelius, and that Luke intended that the speech be complete; to give the impression that the speech was unfinished, because interrupted by the outpouring of the Spirit, is a literary device of Luke, meant simply to make the story more exciting or engaging for the reader⁽²²⁾. On the other hand, the fiction is that Peter was interrupted, that we can suppose there was more that Peter wanted to say⁽²³⁾. If this is so, then 11,15 can be understood to represent what Luke has already presented in 10,34-43: Peter had progressed some of the way, but not all of the way, in his discourse to Cornelius — when the Spirit came.

⁽¹⁹⁾ All told, forms of *archomai* (never seen in its active form in Acts) appear 10 times.

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf., e.g., R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, I (Zurich 1986) 60, n. 7.

⁽²¹⁾ HAENCHEN, *Acts*, 137, n. 4.

⁽²²⁾ Cf., e.g., J. ROLOFF, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD; Göttingen 1981) 174: “Freilich ist die Predigt, wie Lukas sie mitgeteilt hat, kein Torso”.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. B. PAPA, *Atti degli Apostoli*, I (Bologna 1981) 323; here Papa argues that the interruption of the Petrine speech is intended to show that the conversion of the Gentiles, in this instance at least, came from divine favor and not from the kerygmatic preaching. This means that the same Luke wants the speech and does not want it, and Papa cites the apparent discrepancy between 10,34-43 and 11,15 (“mentre io ‘incominciavo a parlare’...”) as proof of this Lucan emphasis on the divine favor as cause of the conversion of Cornelius. But, if one sees no discrepancy between 10,34-43 and 11,15 — the one being (fictively) an incomplete speech and the other a statement that Peter had entered some distance into his speech before the Spirit descended — one might have a more coherent exegesis and a less unsure Luke.

Conclusion

In this discussion of 11,15 there is no claim to a thoroughgoing proof that *en de tō arxasthai me lalein* must mean that Peter had already been talking for a while before the Spirit fell upon Cornelius and his household. The discussion here was meant to argue that Dibelius' position on the matter, followed by so many⁽²⁴⁾, is, for various reasons and from various viewpoints, dubious. Our discussion suggests we must look elsewhere than the possible uses of *ērxato* with the infinitive to explain Dibelius' choice for his interpretation of 11,15.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

John J. KILGALLEN, S.J.

(²⁴) Cf. the latest of the more authoritative translations, *The New American Bible, The New Testament* (revised; New York 1986) 358.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

James W. FLANAGAN, *David's Social Drama. A Hologram of Israel's Early Iron Age* (The Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series 7/ Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 73). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1988. 373 p. 14,5 × 22. £ 24.000/\$ 45.00.

The series *The Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series* published by Almond Press stands out as the main forum of sociologically oriented studies of ancient Israelite history and culture. The predominant direction has been sociological analyses which follow the mainly American tradition of "holistic research", system theory and related matters.

This comprehensive monograph published by the editor of the series may be considered the natural continuation of the flow of holistic studies and its subject is the appearance of the Davidic state at the end of the Early Iron Age in Palestine. Flanagan is, however, well aware of the limitations of a number of preceding studies of this type, especially their inability to encompass the unpredictability of the human nature, as the British social anthropologist Edmund Leach so aptly expressed it a long time ago. Flanagan therefore proceeds to formulate a new and more complicated model for sociological studies of Israelite society, a model which consists of sociological, ecological, historical and literary elements and which is intended to be so complex as to be able to command the diversity of human decisions.

The book consists of three main parts. The first is devoted to the use of sociological studies in Old Testament research, the second proposes a holographic model for the reconstruction of the history of Palestine in the Early Iron Age, and the third attempts a description of the reconstructed history of Israelite society in the 11th cent. BC — or at least an outline of the direction of the historical development in Palestinian society in those days. At the end of the book follow some excursuses, notably on geographical and archaeological issues, but also on a "case study" (the modern history of the emergence of the state of Ibn Saud), and some remarks on the genealogies of Saul and David.

In the first part, the author surprises his reader by presenting a review of certain recent contributions to the evaluation of the Old Testament

narratives about the early Israelite kings. The main emphasis is placed on studies written by David Gunn and Edmund Leach. The contributions from these and other scholars may now be considered as having fatally undermined the earlier "historicist" views of Leonhardt Rost and others that these narratives can be used as historically reliable accounts of the early history of the Hebrew monarchy. Already in this section, the author indicates that his intention is to present a quite different analysis of the Old Testament tradition of David in a following section of his book, namely by reconstructing "David's social drama" (by "social drama" the author means the *scenario* which "allows us to examine the relationship between occurrences in a society and the society's myths", cf. p. 317). The reader becomes, however, even more surprised when he realizes that these literary considerations are immediately followed up by a general discussion about first of all recent archaeological methodology and then modern application of social anthropology to biblical study. As might be expected, the endeavours of G.E. Mendenhall and N.K. Gottwald to reconstruct the oldest history of Israel on a sociological basis are duly acknowledged. The final part of this section of Flanagan's study describes the situation of the modern biblical scholar who is, on the one hand, confronted with obviously contradictory facts and, on the other, is intent on presenting a consistent picture of Israel's past history.

In this connection Flanagan introduces his "holistic" model (which may, at the same time, also be considered a *metaphor*), and he spends — also a surprising feature in a study in ancient history — much time on describing the technique of the hologram. His "metaphor" is, however, not meaningless. On the one hand the hologram may provide a three-dimensional and very plastic picture of an item, whereas on the other the realistic character of the hologram is elusive and can only become visible when the person who studies the hologram has chosen the appropriate position from which to examine it. Thus the hologram is "able" to disappear completely if the examiner has chosen the wrong position. Flanagan illustrates this fundamental character of the hologram by means of a gimmick, a holographic picture of Michelangelo's statue of David which is printed on the cover of his book. At the same time he proceeds to construct such a hologram of Palestine in the Early Iron Age by adducing every kind of information which can be deduced from different areas of research, from the study of the biblical tradition, or from archaeology and sociology. At the very point where all these bits of information converge, the hologram will appear, or so he believes.

The main part of the book is devoted to the construction of the holographic picture (or model) of Early Iron society in Palestine, and two main areas are adduced to construct this picture, on the one hand archaeological remains and on the other the literary tradition of the Old Testament. As far as archaeology is concerned, Flanagan wants to construct a systemic model which can be used to study the archaeological and sociological history of the Early Iron Age, and when dealing with the literary tradition he intends archaeologically to "stratify" the different notions and pictures of David and his career which are contained in the

various literary layers, in the Psalms, in the Chronistic and Deuteronomistic literary strata, and in the so-called "Samuel Model", meaning the predeuteronomistic tradition contained in the books of Samuel. Also in this case the various notions are combined into a systemic model.

The relatively short conclusion presents a reconstruction of the history of this early era in Israelite history which Flanagan describes as David's social drama. However, it is a historical reconstruction which differs a lot from what is usually understood to be an actual historical remoulding of the past. We should not expect to find a clear and chronologically subdivided description of the historical process. Rather we are confronted with a number of indications that certain processes and developments may have occurred in the early Israelite state.

In comparison with earlier studies of the same general scholarly tradition Flanagan's new book represents an immense advance, although this advance has been gained at the cost of clarity as far as the details are concerned. If we compare Flanagan's study with other similar endeavours the result may seem flickering. The study presents a detailed discussion of its subject, however, to the non-specialist (including the traditional historian) much of this information is presented in such a way as to become very difficult to digest. The "style" used by the author contributes to the difficulties. Flanagan is always very conscious of the methodological issues and at every possible point he inserts some additional reflections on method, to such an extent that, at the end, these repeated admonitions are more apt to represent "noise" than actual information and thus they actually blur his case (by "noise" this reviewer [and Flanagan] understands irrelevant information which disturbs the communication of real information). It may thus be counted as "noise" when the author has devoted more than a hundred pages to the question of methodology — in a book of this size. And even after these introductory sections the author never bypasses an opportunity to revert to methodological issues. Without doubt the book would have benefited from a tightening of its style.

This reviewer cannot blame the author for presenting a development in holistic studies which makes the models far more complicated than formerly. The real problem of this research has been that it seems to be presenting simplistic reconstructions of human societies whereas what it actually presents is a distorted view of the acts of man (cf. N. P. Lemche, *Early Israel*, 216-219, and idem, "On the Use of "System Theory", "Macro Theories" and "Evolutionistic Thinking" in Modern OT Research and Biblical Archaeology", *JSOT* 1990/2). Nobody can rightfully describe Flanagan's model (or hologram) as "simplistic", rather to the contrary the model is becoming so intricate that it may be useless as a scholarly device. It could be maintained that the model has got the upper hand over the scholar.

Sadly Flanagan's study appeared almost at the same time as Israel Finkelstein's immensely valuable review of the archaeological investigations into Iron Age Palestine (*The Archaeology of the Israelite Settlement*, 1988). Of course Flanagan cannot be blamed for this coincidence. However, his study would have benefited enormously if he had known the material in

Finkelstein's book. As it stands, the description in Flanagan's book of the archaeological developments in Palestine in the early Iron Age is in some important aspects contradicted by Finkelstein. Especially the general direction of the demographic developments may be questioned on this account (although Finkelstein's evaluation may not always be unproblematic). In his archaeological reconstruction Flanagan actually discloses his point of departure, which is the "revolutionary" explanation of Israel's origins as originally proposed by Mendenhall and later corroborated by Gottwald. In some respects we may see Flanagan's study as another attempt to place this revolutionary hypothesis on a more solid scholarly basis.

That Flanagan's study can be related in this way to the earlier works of Mendenhall and Gottwald becomes obvious when reading the book. First and foremost, some presuppositions which are shared by Mendenhall and Gottwald re-emerge in this study especially in the evaluation of the ideological impulses which were an active force in the early Israelite society of the Iron Age. Flanagan thus operates with a kind of Israelite tribal "system" which was originally pre-Yahwistic, later to become Yahwistic, and he characterizes the traditions of this society as "Yahwistic" in much the same manner as earlier Martin Noth, or Mendenhall and Gottwald. However, what does "Yahwistic" mean in the 11th cent. BC? And how are we to know that David based his career on the existence of a society with a "Yahwistic" ideology? We may thus be entitled to see the former device or *deus ex machina* of Mendenhall and Gottwald (that is, the Yahwistic group around Moses coming from "the desert" with their Yahwistic religion) as operative also in this study (although it is never mentioned by name), when Flanagan maintains that the Yahwistic ideology was in force in premonarchical Israelite society, although this Yahwistic ideology is only found in much later Old Testament *literary* contexts.

Although it may be welcomed that the study of the Old Testament tradition is freed of the usual historical-critical presuppositions (and actually Flanagan's analysis of the Davidic tradition represents the most inspired part of his volume), his readers are, however, provoked into asking some rather dull and traditional historical-critical questions. Thus, if the tradition about David in the books of Samuel is as young as proposed for example by John Van Seters (an author mentioned by Flanagan, but without discussion of his contribution), how can it be that literary sources which originated in the exilic or even post-exilic period are concerned with the whereabouts of Palestinian society more than half a millennium earlier? Flanagan may answer that the dating of these sources is immaterial because the evidence of these late sources may, after all, be considered to represent late reflections based on the "myths" of early Israelite society and thus be part of his holographic picture of Early Iron Age society. However, faced with such an assumption we may maintain that the narratives about David may well be bereft of any historical value at all. In the light of their late appearance, these narratives (as well as the reflections on them in the Book of Psalms and elsewhere) may actually represent a "Jewish" myth concerning the early "history" of the Jewish nation, although embedded in

Jewish society in, say 600-400 BC, and thus the narratives may reflect the political aspirations of late Jewish society rather than sentiments and notions going back to pre-exilic times, not to say the pre-state period. It has no bearing on this problem that Flanagan is able to adduce a modern "case study", the story of Ibn Saud, as an analogy to the fate of king David. The fact that such an analogy can, after all, be called upon only demonstrates that the narratives about David cannot exclusively be related to events in the early Iron Age. Actually they would fit the societal picture of Palestine until modern times, up to the emergence of the modern state of Israel.

In conclusion, we must emphasize that in comparison with earlier examples of "holistic" studies in the field of Old Testament study, Flanagan's volume represents an important advance by not contributing to the simplification of the historical process. On the other hand, his model has perhaps become so intricate that it is difficult to digest and, accordingly, to make practical use of as a means to study a concrete historical and social phenomenon such as early Israelite society. Furthermore, in spite of his inspiring textual analyses, Flanagan has not solved the fundamental *hermeneutical* problem of the application of the Old Testament traditions in the study of Israelite history, perhaps because, after all, he is too eager to bridge the lapse of time between the Early Iron Age and the age in which the Old Testament literary sources were composed, although he tries to escape the usual confusion of literary studies and historical investigations.

Smedebakken 12, Gurre
DK — 3490 Kvistgård
Denmark

Niels Peter LEMCHE

Edmond JACOB, *Esaïe 1-12* (Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament VIIIa). Genève, Labor et Fides, 1987. 175 p. 24 × 18.

Edmond Jacob ist seit Jahrzehnten eine bekannte Gestalt im internationalen Kreis der Alttestamentler. Er legt hier in der Reihe "Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament", zu der er bereits vor mehr als zwei Jahrzehnten einen Hosea-Kommentar beigesteuert hat, den ersten Band eines Kommentars zum Buch Jesaja vor. Offenbar ist dabei an einen Kommentar zum ganzen Buch Jesaja gedacht, obwohl dies nirgends ausdrücklich gesagt wird.

Damit kommt sogleich ein Charakteristikum dieses Kommentars in Blick. In der ausführlichen Einleitung (7-33) betont der Verfasser, wie es schon die Grundsatzserklärung zu der ganzen Kommentarreihe zum Ausdruck bringt, daß er sich der historisch-kritischen Methode verpflichtet weiß. Das bedeutet, daß er in dem Abschnitt "Le livre et sa formation" (14-19) zunächst die seit dem Ende des vorigen Jahrhunderts in der Forschung etablierte Annahme eines "Deuterojesaja" und eines "Tritojesaja" anerkennt und sie sogar als "unbestreitbaren Fortschritt" bezeichnet (14). Dann trennt er jedoch nicht den zweiten und dritten Teil vom ersten

ab, wie es viele Exegeten seither getan haben und tun, sondern versucht, die Entstehung des ganzen Jesajabuches als einen innerlich zusammenhängenden Prozeß zu begreifen, der in verschiedenen Etappen verlaufen ist. Er präzisiert seine Sicht, indem er annimmt, daß bestimmte Teilsammlungen wie z.B. Kap. 6–9; 28–31 und die Orakel über andere Völker (Kap. 13–23) schon vor dem Exil in ihrer jetzigen Form vorlagen und daß die Exulanten sie “in ihrem Gepäck mitnahmen, sie lasen und in ihnen die Deutung ihrer Geschichte fanden” (16). Dies stärkte sie zugleich in der Anfechtung durch den Polytheismus ihrer Umwelt und hielt in ihnen die Gewißheit aufrecht, “daß der wahre Gott auf ihrer Seite war” und “daß ihre Gefangenschaft ein Ende haben würde” (ebd.). Aus dieser Stimmung heraus begrüßten sie “mit Enthusiasmus” das Auftreten des Kyros als des “Begründers ihrer Rückkehr”.

Damit ist die Brücke zu Deuterjesaja geschlagen. Jacob skizziert den weiteren Entstehungsprozeß, wobei er Kap. 40–55 (“Deuterjesaja”) und Kap. 56–66 (“Tritojesaja”) durchaus in ihrem jeweiligen exilischen bzw. nachexilischen Kontext interpretiert, bis er schließlich zur Annahme einer Rahmung des ganzen Jesajabuches durch Kap. 1 und 66 kommt, deren Wechselbeziehungen er in einer Aufzählung von 16 wörtlichen Beziehungen demonstriert (18). Diese beiden Kapitel umschließen ein Buch, das zwar zahlreiche Autoren hat, die sich über drei Jahrhunderte verteilen. Es ist aber dennoch auf wenige zentrale Themen konzentriert, die alle auf Jerusalem bezogen sind: das Königtum Gottes, der davidische Bund, die Stadt der Gerechtigkeit und des Friedens für alle Völker. “Ein Ort, ein Buch, vielfaches Echo der Stimme eines großen Propheten — das ist die Betrachtung, die für unsere Zeit aus einem Buch ein lebendiges Wort werden lassen kann” (19).

Hier handelt es sich um einen im Grunde konservativen Ansatz, der die allgemein anerkannten Thesen der historisch-kritischen Forschung in einer Weise aufnimmt, die es ermöglicht, dennoch die Person des Propheten zum verbindenden Element des ganzen Jesajabuches zu machen. Daß dies die eigentliche Intention des Verfassers ist, zeigt sich schon darin, daß er den Kommentar mit einem Abschnitt “Der Mensch und der Prophet” beginnt (7–9, unter Einbeziehung der außerbiblischen Traditionen über die Herkunft Jesajas aus königlicher Familie und über sein Martyrium), dem dann ein Abschnitt über “Jesaja und seine Zeit” folgt (10–11). Erst nach einem weiteren Abschnitt über “Text und Versionen” (11–13) behandelt dann der vierte Abschnitt “Das Buch und seine Entstehung” (14–19).

Es liegt gleichwohl nahe, daß Jacob aus der neueren exegetischen Diskussion diejenigen Stimmen aufgreift, die seiner Sicht entgegenkommen. So spricht er in einem Abschnitt über neuere Literatur zum Jesajabuch (26–28) von einer heute bestehenden “allgemeinen Tendenz, die Aufmerksamkeit auf die Einheit des Buches zu richten”, wodurch die Frage nach den *ipsissima verba* des Propheten hinter dem Interesse an der von ihm begründeten Tradition zurücktritt. Ja, man erkennt sogar durch alle Teile des Buches hindurch eine “esaïcité”, sowohl in der Form als auch im Denken, die es weiter zu untersuchen gilt (28). In dem letzten Abschnitt der Einleitung über den vorliegenden Kommentar selbst (28–30) betont er dann die Bedeu-

tung des "kanonischen Kontextes" und nennt dabei die Namen von J. A. Sanders und B. S. Childs.

Allerdings zeigt sich bei genauerem Hinsehen, daß Jacobs exegetischer Ansatz mit diesen von ihm zitierten neueren Tendenzen in Wirklichkeit wenig gemeinsam hat. Insbesondere fällt auf, daß die Fragen der Komposition des Buches, und d.h. auch des kompositorischen Zusammenhangs der einzelnen Texte, kaum gestellt werden. Demgegenüber stehen Datierungsfragen, und damit verbunden notwendigerweise die Frage der Authentizität der Jesajaworte im Vordergrund. Man kann dies an einem Vergleich mit dem programmatischen Beitrag von P. R. Ackroyd "Isaiah I-XII: Presentation of a Prophet" (VTSupp 26, 1978) verdeutlichen, den Jacob zwar im Literaturverzeichnis (31) nennt, im Text selbst aber nicht verarbeitet. Die dort entfaltenen Fragen der Komposition tauchen bei Jacob nicht auf. So spielt z.B. bei Ackroyd Kap. 12 eine bedeutsame Rolle als betonter und im einzelnen reflektierter Abschluß der Sammlung Kap. 1-12. Jacob betrachtet das Kapitel als Psalm, den er mit anderen Psalmen im Jesajabuch vergleicht (so in Kap. 40ff und in der "Apokalypse" Kap. 24-27), um daran die Frage nach dem liturgischen Gebrauch von Prophetenworten anzuschließen. Auch die Stellung von 2,1-5 als Abschluß der ersten Komposition 1,2-2,5, die schon Fohrer angenommen hat und die bei Ackroyd eine zentrale Rolle für das Verständnis der Komposition spielt, wird nicht erörtert. Bei dem Abschnitt 4,2-6 wird wiederum die Frage der Stellung zum Kontext nicht gestellt, stattdessen aber die Datierungsfrage erörtert, bei der die Zeit Deuterjesajas oder Esras erwogen werden. Dabei ist für Jacob vor allem wieder die Beziehung dieser Texte zur Person des Propheten wichtig: Sie sind "ein Echo der Weise, in der die Worte Jesajas von der Gemeinde des Zweiten Tempels gelesen wurden" (72). Hier zeigt sich besonders deutlich die in diesem Kommentar herrschende Grundkonzeption: Grundlage und Ausgangspunkt ist die historische Person des Propheten Jesaja mit seiner Verkündigung; die übrigen Texte des Buches sind *lecture* und *relecture* dieser Texte und ihre Fortschreibung unter veränderten zeitgeschichtlichen Umständen.

Im übrigen liegt der Auslegung das Konzept der einzelnen, je für sich gesprochenen Prophetenworte zugrunde, die erst später gesammelt wurden. So behandelt Jacob die Texte in den meisten Fällen in ihrer üblichen Abgrenzung, häufig kapitelweise, ohne nach ihrer Verbindung untereinander zu fragen. Besonders auffällig ist dies bei Kap. 6-9, wo die in der Literatur häufige Erörterung der "Denkschrift" 6,1-9,6 nicht erwähnt wird. (In der Einleitung werden Kap. 6-9 ohne genauere Abgrenzung als eine der ältesten Einheiten genannt, während in der Exegese der Einschnitt nach 9,6 liegt.) Einzelne Themen von besonderer Bedeutung werden gelegentlich in exkursartigen Abschnitten behandelt wie z.B. "Der Prozeß Jhwhs gegen sein Volk" (rib, 42f), "Die Farbe der Sünde (!)" (47f), "Das Thema des Weinstocks außerhalb des Jesajabuches" (81), "Die Seraphim: Name, Form, Funktion" (99f) usw.

Schließlich gehört es zu den Charakteristika des Kommentars, daß immer wieder auf neutestamentliche und christologische Bezüge hingewiesen wird, gelegentlich in eigenen Abschnitten über "neutestamentliche Perspek-

tiven" o.ä. (z.B. 81, 104). Jes 8,23–9,6 werden als Grundlage für eine "mehr dynamische als dogmatische Christologie" interpretiert (141). Und durch den Hinweis auf eine christologische Auslegungstradition von Kap. 12, die in dem hier häufig wiederkehrenden Wort *yešū'āh* den Namen Jesus liest, bildet dieser Name auch das letzte Wort des Kommentars in diesem Band.

Am Bächenbuckel 24/1
D-6900 Heidelberg

Rolf RENDTORFF

Erhard S. GERSTENBERGER, *Psalms*. Part I with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry (The Forms of Old Testament Literature XIV). Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1988. xv-260 p. 15 × 22,8.

In the first half of his two volumes on Psalms in the series "The Forms of Old Testament Literature" Erhard Gerstenberger has offered an approach which moves decisively away from the royal/Sion cultic interpretation and towards setting many of the psalms in the life of post-exilic synagogue-type congregations. Brief opening sections on the uses of song, ritual and worship in Israel and the ancient Near East lead to a more extended treatment of the genres of cultic poetry under the headings of dirges and laments, complaints, thanksgivings, hymns, royal psalms and wisdom psalms.

Already in these opening sections, the main lines of the author's treatment become clear. It is suggested that the primary cultic setting for Israel's psalms was the local group worshipping at local sanctuaries or within the family group, observing family and agricultural festivals, and coping with personal or communal misfortunes of various types. The royal cult did not involve the presence of ordinary people. Further, the worship of higher-level social groupings such as "tribes" or the kingdom adapted the uses of the smaller groups to their own needs. Thus the royal cult in Israel was not primary, and the worship of the ordinary people was not a democratised version of the royal cult. Even if the latter in Israel was influenced by royal cults from elsewhere in the ancient Near East, these in turn had been adapted from the worship of family or local groups. Following the destruction of the First Temple there developed in Palestine and elsewhere synagogue-type congregations which composed psalms which drew upon the imagery of Sion, the royal dynasty and the election of Israel, in order to express the longings of Israel for freedom and restoration. Within this general scheme, Gerstenberger suggests that individual complaint psalms were used locally within extended family groups, and that these ceremonies were conducted by local ritual experts. The wisdom psalms did not derive from the literary work of the scribal schools but originated in the post-exilic congregations, where communal instruction was part of the worship of those who assembled together.

There are several more brief sections, on the growth of the psalter, the social settings of the psalms, their poetic language, their theology — this

section is less than a page long and simply describes the psalms as a treasury of experience over many generations — and the books of the psalter. The section on the growth of the psalter identifies as later pre-exilic collections, Psalms 42-49, 78-83, 96-99, 111-118 and 120-134. Exilic collections are 3-41, 42-83 (incorporating 51-72), 84-89, 108-110 and 138-145.

Because volume 1 covers the introduction and Psalms 1-60 only, any review is bound to be provisional to some extent, because it is not possible to see the work as a whole. What, for example, will Gerstenberger say about Psalms such as 93, 97-99 and 110? Within the limitations of reviewing volume 1, the following points can be made.

The treatment of “royal psalms” such as 2, 20-21, 45-47 usually follows the line that although royal rituals or ideas may be invoked, the psalms as we now have them are to be set in the post-exilic synagogue-type communities. The exception is 45 which is accepted as a royal wedding song which was used either in Judah or Israel, and on more than one occasion.

In Psalm 2 the determining factors in placing the psalm are the wisdom-type admonition of verses 10-12 and the aspirations of universal rule that are found in verses 7-9. Gerstenberger regards these latter sentiments as more appropriate to the post-exilic period, when synagogue-type congregations of the 6th-3rd centuries looked forward to a restoration of Israel under God’s rule over the whole world. This restoration would be centred upon Jerusalem and would be achieved by a descendant of David. Although the psalm may allude to royal rituals (verses 7-8) it has a complex form including a lament (verses 1-3), assurance of victory (verses 3-6) and the wisdom admonition. In spite of this complexity, Gerstenberger classifies this as a Messianic hymn.

Gerstenberger’s treatment of Psalms 20-21 takes on more of the flavour of a tour de force. There are quite explicit references in these passages to the king and readers may wonder whether the arguments for not treating them as royal psalms are contrived. In Psalm 20, verses 7-9 have language in the first person plural which Gerstenberger takes to be the response of the congregation; and the same is true of 21,13. Further, in 20,9 the word “king” may be taken as referring to God, although anointed in 20,6 cannot be taken thus. While it seems to be special pleading to claim that “anointed” in 20,6 and “king” in 21,1.7 may be figurative, Gerstenberger is right to point out that 21,1-7 is not a prayer, but an address to God in which divine blessings in past times are recalled. The structure of these psalms is certainly far from straightforward. Because of his view that the ordinary people did not participate in the royal cult, Gerstenberger allows the “congregational” references of 20,7-9 and 21,13 to determine the setting of these psalms, which is in the post-exilic community. Past traditions or ideas are drawn upon in order to sustain the hope of a community that looks forward to a restoration, and which seeks God’s help in the present. It can be asked whether this is not too one-sided an approach and whether an approach would do better justice to the material which saw 20,7-9 and 21,13 as post-exilic glosses which served to adapt royal psalms to the needs of the post-exilic situation.

Two other psalms which have often been placed in the pre-exilic Zion or royal cult are 46 and 47. Gerstenberger does not deny that 47 in particular has a cultic setting; but he finds the situation in the post-exilic community because, even at its peak, the davidic dynasty did not have the aspirations to universal rule that the psalm expresses. This psalm recalls God's election of Israel and uses it as the basis for a hymn about God's power in the world. The setting of Psalm 46 is a post-exilic community living among the nations and strengthening its hope by meditating upon Zion as an ideal, distant or symbolic focus for God's power.

Another feature of Gerstenberger's approach is his preference for the local sanctuary or the local group as the setting for psalms that are often placed in the Jerusalem temple. Psalm 3 is a good example. Whereas it has been associated with a night vigil in the temple, Gerstenberger argues that verse 4 (he answers *from* his holy mountain) rules out the temple. The psalm derives from a private ceremony, possibly in the early morning following preparations the night before. The enemies of the psalmist are not identified, and may be other members of his group, or what are believed to be demonic powers. After it was detached from its original setting and was included in the psalter, the psalm was connected with David's flight from Absalom. There is a similar treatment of Psalm 4. Its purpose, according to Gerstenberger, was to reintegrate into a social group people who were poor, or despised or suspect. It was performed either outside the local sanctuary or in one of its side-chambers.

Gerstenberger's views of other, selected, psalms may be summarised as follows. Psalm 8 is a hymn of a synagogue-type community which allows the doubts of individuals to find expression (verses 3-4), and which implies neither a "tribal" nor a centralised society. Its outlook is that of scribes who organised the post-exilic congregations and who drew upon creation traditions in order to help small communities to feel at home in a hostile world. Psalm 15 may originally have stated the conditions for ritual purity required by worshippers; but in its present form all hint of ritual is absent, and the psalm implies the ethical and spiritualised religion of a post-exilic congregation.

Psalm 24 celebrates the coming of God to the sanctuary; but whereas many interpreters detect a ceremony in pre-exilic times involving the carrying of the Ark in procession Gerstenberger prefers either a later temple ceremony of the coming of God (compare Ezekiel 43-44) or a ceremony in the post-exilic community. Psalms 42-43 are placed in the Persian period, and are ascribed to a congregation beset by anxiety, and using the Jerusalem temple as a focus for faith and hope. Although the psalm contains all the ingredients of an individual complaint, the implied individual is the mouthpiece for the congregation. There are no biographical details about the individual and the introverted language of the opening of the psalm is a literary device and not the psychological reflections of an individual.

There are many aspects of this book that make it a welcome and important addition to literature on the psalms, and one that many teachers will want to recommend to their students. In addition to its clear structure and argumentation, it regularly provides comparative tables of the differing

verse numbers in the MT and the RSV. A glossary of 17 pages contains, in addition to definitions, important comments and useful references to secondary literature.

In its general approach, the book makes it clear that, if the formal literary classification of parts or all of the psalms is relatively straightforward, the question of setting is quite another matter. This will be largely determined by the sociological or cultic assumptions that one brings to the text. Gerstenberger seems to me to be correct in assuming that the royal cult of Sion was not one in which the ordinary people took part. The Jerusalem temple must have served as a chapel royal until Josiah tried to make it into a national sanctuary. It is striking that there is so little reference in the psalms to the sacrificial cult that presumably was carried out in the temple. This being so, I would agree with Gerstenberger that it is wiser to look to local settings for the psalms that deal with the problems of individuals; and in the interpretation of royal psalms we should not suppose that they imply great national ceremonies at which all the people were present.

On the other hand, Gerstenberger seems to me to go too far in the opposite direction in maintaining that what look like royal psalms are really later congregational pieces that draw upon royal ideology. If the royal cult was not something in which ordinary people participated, why was it that they were so keen to use its symbols as a focus for their hopes and aspirations in their post-exilic communities? A more likely explanation is that royal psalms in something like their original forms were taken over by these communities and glossed in order to be used in the new circumstances.

However, even if we think that Gerstenberger has sometimes gone too far in imposing upon the text ideas based upon theories of social development, we can be grateful for a book that challenges old ideas, suggests new ones, and shows how little we really know about the psalms.

The University of Sheffield
Department of Biblical Studies
GB – Sheffield S10 2TN

J. W. ROGERSON

Hermann SPIECKERMANN, *Heilsgegenwart. Eine Theologie der Psalmen* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 148). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989. 342 p. 15,5 × 23. Kart. DM 80,00. Lw. DM 118,00.

Das Vorwort (7-20) des anregenden Werkes trägt die Überschrift «Das Problem», und es ist zu hoffen, daß viele das Problem in den Blick bekommen. Es geht um den eigentlichen theologischen Quellgrund der Psalmen. Dieser ist weder in den heilsgeschichtlichen Traditionen noch im Prophetismus oder in der Weisheit zu suchen, sondern in der vorexilischen Jerusalemer Tempeltheologie. Der Stammesgott Jahwe, der aus der Wüste kam, hat

sich als königlicher Kerubenthroner in einem Tempel niedergelassen und den nach mythischen Vorstellungen der Kanaanäer geprägten Kult an sich gezogen. Die Berechtigung dieser Sicht wird in fünf Abschnitten mit je verschiedenem Thema auf hohem fachlichem und sprachlichem Niveau dargetan: I. Jahwe, der Schöpfer und Erhalter (21-86), II. Jahwe, der Gott seines Volkes (87-164), III. Jahwe, der Herr seines Heiligtums (165-225), IV. Jahwe, mein König und mein Gott (226-283), V. Jahwe — Gegenwart und Heil des Namens (284-292). Die Abschnitte I-IV behandeln jeweils ausführlich eine Reihe einschlägiger Psalmen und erweitern noch global die Basis der Beweisführung über diese ausgewählten Psalmen hinaus. Für Abschn. I sind exemplarisch Pss 104, 148 und 19, für Abschn. II Ex 15 sowie Pss 137, 74, 78 und 114, für Abschn. III Pss 29, 93, 48, 24 und 21, für Abschn. IV Pss 8, 22, 30 und 23. Auch wer mit den Grundauffassungen des Buches seine Schwierigkeiten hat, wird die geschliffenen Ausführungen mit Gewinn lesen. Hilfreich ist an jeweiliger Stelle eine Übersetzung der Psalmentexte mit kennzeichnung der sekundären Passagen. In einem Anhang (312-335) wird entsprechend der hebräische Text geboten. Literaturliste und Stellenverzeichnis sind beigegeben, doch fehlt ein Autorenregister.

Der Verf. weiß seine Psalmentheologie (vgl. den Untertitel des Werkes) mit bemerkenswertem Integrationsvermögen abzusichern. Es liegt ihm fern, formkritische Forschung Gunkelscher Prägung in Frage zu stellen; doch ist sie ihm für eine Theo-logia nicht ergiebig (vgl. etwa 9, Anm. 3), und er ist bestrebt, hinter den Formen den heilvollen Deus praesens des vorexilischen Kultes zu entdecken. Die radikale kultische Deutung Mowinckelscher und königsideologischer Prägung ist dem Verf. im Grunde recht; doch ist sie ihm zu religionsgeschichtlich eingestellt. Ferner ist der Verf. sich dessen bewußt, daß der biblische Psalter als neuinterpretierende Auffangstelle nur ein indirekter Zeuge der vorexilischen Psalmdichtung sein kann und auch Nebenströmungen, namentlich die Weisheit (vgl. 19, Anm. 33) in sich aufgenommen hat. Am nachdrücklichsten setzt er sich mit den traditionsgeschichtlichen Auffassungen der Ära Noths und von Rads auseinander, in der man die Tempeltheologie des Verf. wohl kaum als genuin israelitisch eingeschätzt hätte. Dieser Gegnerschaft wird klar gemacht, daß ihre Lieblingskategorien (Bundesfest, Bundeslade u.ä.) nicht tragfähig sind. Das Alte Testament sei weder aus einem geschichtlichen Credo noch aus einem Nationalepos herausgewachsen, sondern aus der Gebetspraxis des vorexilischen Tempels (vgl. 292).

Eine kritische Anfrage betrifft zunächst und vor allem die Datierung der Psalmen, mit der gewisse Fehleinschätzungen des Verf. zusammenhängen. Eine Grundfassung von Ps 104 soll vor dem 7. Jahrh. entstanden sein (47), ebenso eine Grundfassung von Ps 148 (58f), ja sogar von Ps 136 (vgl. 162, Anm. 10). Ps 19 dagegen soll, auch in der Grundfassung, ein später Psalm sein (67f). Das Mose-Lied von Ex 15 soll — wieder in einer Grundfassung — aus nachsalomonischer, aber vorjesajanischer Zeit stammen (113f). Pss 137, 74 und 78 sind dagegen wieder eine späte Verarbeitung der Tempeltheologie (vgl. 116 bzw. 126 und 140); ebenfalls nachexilisch datiert wird Ps 114 (153), übrigens ohne daß analog zu Ps 19 eine Zusammen-

gehörigkeit mit Ps 115 erwogen würde. Ps 29 gehört in die älteste oder ältere Königszeit (179, Anm. 30), Ps 93 auf jeden Fall in die vorexilische Zeit (181, Anm. 5). (Ps 93 wird also von Pss 47 und 96–99, die auch der Verf. als spät anerkennt, zeitlich getrennt, obwohl das nomistische *'edotaejkā* von Ps 93,7 in die Nähe von Ps 119 versetzt.) Von den sogenannten Zionsliedern ist nur Ps 48 vorexilisch (196), im Gegensatz zu Pss 46 und 76. Pss 24 und 21 sind in einer Grundfassung vorexilisch (208, Anm. 25 bzw. S. 217), was S. 217 auch mit Bezug auf Pss 2; 18,33–47; 45; 72 sowie eventuell 20 und 110 ins Auge gefaßt wird. Schließlich entscheidet sich der Verf. noch für vorexilische Datierung von Ps 8 (238) und von Ps 22 samt andern Psalmen der gleichen Ausrichtung (252), während Ps 30 und Ps 23 eher spät anzusetzen seien (256 bzw. 270).

Völlig zu Recht hat der Verf. die Psalmen mit heilsgeschichtlichen Elementen (vgl. besonders Abschn. II) als exilisch-nachexilisch erkannt und somit als Zeugnisse eines späten Fortlebens der Tempeltheologie. (Eine Ausnahme macht er im Falle von Ex 15. Glaubt er im Ernst, daß die vorexilische Tempeltheologie eine Linie vom Schilfmeer zum Jerusalemer Heiligtum von Ex 15,17 gezogen hätte?) Entschieden zurückzuweisen sind jedoch praktisch alle Datierungen in die vorexilische Zeit. Hier hat sich der Verf. von dem Wunsch leiten lassen, Originalzeugen seiner vorexilischen Tempeltheologie vorzuführen. In einigen Fällen zahlt er dafür den Preis einer ganz indiskutablen und am untauglichen Objekt vorgenommenen Unterscheidung zwischen Grundfassung und späterer Ergänzung (vgl. weiter unten). Zu erwägen ist sie höchstens in Pss 21 und 22. Ein fragwürdiges Kriterium, das wiederholt (in Abschn. I) die späteren Zusätze ausweisen soll, ist das Vorkommen des Schöpfungsgedankens im Sinne der *prima creatio*, demgegenüber die vorexilische Tempeltheologie auf *conservatio* und *gubernatio* ausgerichtet sei. Nun gibt der Verf. anscheinend selbst zu, daß die konstituierende Schöpfungstat in Ps 104,2b dem Dichter der (angeblich) vorexilischen Grundfassung nicht fremd ist (vgl. 28f, Anm. 23 und 24). Die Verbindung von *prima creatio* und *gubernatio* ist in der Tat die natürlichste Sache der Welt. Dann kann immer noch verdienstlich herausgestellt werden, ob und inwieweit die *gubernatio* in nicht reflektierenden poetischen Texten ein Übergewicht hat. Der Schöpfungsgedanke kann überhaupt nur vom Geschaffenen der anschaulich gemacht werden. Das erwähnte Kriterium (vgl. zusammenfassend 73–86) taugt nicht für die Begründung einer Schichtung.

Wir werden uns damit abfinden müssen, daß es außer den Gebetsformen des Klage- und Dankliedes keine Zeugnisse der vorexilischen Tempeltheologie gibt, die den Bereich des Mythischen tangieren. Zugänglich ist uns nur das gefilterte, renaissanceartige Fortleben in nachexilischer Zeit. Die historische Tempeltheologie der Königszeit war wohl gar nicht so harmlos, wie es der Verf. voraussetzt. Die Zustände im Jerusalemer Tempel waren nach der unverdächtigen Information der Königsbücher zeitweise katastrophal. Nicht von ungefähr hat es — m.E. in nachexilischer Zeit — Puristen wie den Deuteronomisten und den Priesterschriftler gegeben (vgl. dazu 284). Ob nicht auch die Dichter der vom Verf. als vorexilisch ausgegebenen Hymnen im Grunde nachexilische Puristen sind? Mit dem Unterschied freilich, daß sie mit mythischen Motiven unbefangen umgehen. Der Verf. sollte

also bei seiner ansprechenden Darstellung der Theologie der Psalmen den vorexilischen Anspruch aufgeben. Es ist darüber hinaus fraglich, ob eine vorexilische Tempeltheologie als *Quellgrund* dieser Theologie gedacht werden kann. Dafür kommt eher jene exilisch-nachexilische Explosion mit ihrer Heilsverkündigung in Betracht; diese alles beherrschende Strömung hat nicht nur die heilsbegründenden Geschichtsdarstellungen und die Prophetenbücher, sondern auch den Psalter hervorgebracht. Ein nachexilischer Psalm mit «tempeltheologischem» Gehalt ist etwas anderes als sein eventueller vorexilischer Ahn. Mit dem Blick auf die exilisch-nachexilische Heilsverkündigung wäre zu wünschen, daß die Psalmentheologie nicht getrennt von den redaktionellen Aussagen der Prophetenbücher betrachtet wird. Man denke etwa an die Doxologien des Amosbuches, die mit keinem Wort erwähnt werden, und namentlich an Jes 40–55. (Der «tempeltheologische» Passus Jes 51,9–11 wird 113, Anm. 53, gerade noch angeführt.) In Jes 40–55 spielt die Schöpfungstheologie eine bedeutende Rolle. (Zu einer Kritik des vom Verf. nicht berücksichtigten Werkes C. Stuhlmüller, *Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah* [Rom 1970], vgl. *Bib* 53 [1972] 427–431.)

Auf die vom Verf. öfter angenommene Fortschreibung vorexilischer Psalmen müßte an sich ausführlich eingegangen werden. Es sind vor allem die vom Verf. nicht hoch veranschlagten Strukturuntersuchungen (vgl. etwa 24ff), die ein Wort mitreden müßten, wenn aus einer Komposition Stücke herausseziert werden. Hier sollen nur einige kritische Beobachtungen verabreicht werden, die sich beim Durcharbeiten des Werkes eingestellt haben. Der Hinweis des Verf. auf den unachtsamen Umgang mit den Tempora in dem angeblich sekundären Passus Ps 104,5–9 braucht niemand zu beeindrucken (zu 30; vgl. auch 168). Der Terminus *mākôn* in der Bedeutung «Fundament, Stützpfeiler» ist in 104,5a durchaus nicht fehl am Platze (zu 30); diese Bedeutung ist, was S. 30, Anm. 26, nicht deutlich wird, gut belegt in Ps 89,15; 97,2 und Esra 2,68 (vgl. auch die feminine Pluralform *mēkônôt* in Esra 3,3). Die Erwägungen zu Ps 104,8 (31) erübrigen sich, wenn (trotz 22, Anm. 5) Berge und Talebenen Subjekte sind. V. 8b wäre dann die Fortsetzung von V. 7b, während V. 8a bewußt den Satzanschluß sprengt (ähnlich Ps 49,9) und die Landschaftsbildung beschreibt. Schließlich ist ohne jede Strukturakrobatik zu fragen, ob Ps 104,10 jemals ein befriedigender Anschluß an V. 4 sein konnte, was zwangsläufig ist, wenn Vv. 5–9 sekundäre Fortschreibung sein sollen. Ps 104,11 darf, weil zur Originalfassung gehörig, nach Meinung des Verf. Gen 1 nicht gekannt haben (vgl. 34, Anm. 33), weist aber gleichwohl das seltene *wāw compaginis* (*hajtô*) von Gen 1,24 auf und verbindet *hajtô* in der poetisch archaisierenden Form *šādaj* mit dem *šadaeh* von Gen 2,19f(J). Der Dichter hatte Gen 1–2 in ihrer Jetztform vorliegen. In Ps 104,12 (angeblich vom Ergänzter) bezieht sich *lêhaem* m.E. nicht auf die Berge von V. 10b, sondern auf die «Quellen in den *nēhālīm*» von V. 10a, die auch das Subjekt von V. 10b und V. 11a.b sind; *lêhaem* wird «an ihren Ufern» bedeuten (vgl. Ez 47,10.12) und ist demnach nicht so unpassend, wie der Verf. (33) wahr haben will. Ps 104,19 wird nur aus selbstauferlegtem theologischem Zwang — in der Originalfassung darf die *prima creatio* nicht vorkommen — als Zusatz ausgegeben (zu S. 37). In Ps 104,27 dürfte *kullām* sich nicht nur auf V. 24aa'.b' beziehen,

sondern, wie das Wort sagt, eben auf *alles*, was in Vv. 24-26 aufgezählt wird (zu Ss. 40-42). Es ist nicht konsequent, daß die *tannînim* von Ps 148,7 alte Tempeltheologie sind, der Leviathan in Ps 104,26 dagegen wegen der Idee der creatio prima sekundär sein muß (41), zumal das Nebeneinander von Seeungeheuer und Schiffen schon im Echnaton-Hymnus belegt ist (vgl. auch 125, Anm. 8). Was ist davon zu halten, daß Ps 104,33 (ohne Vv. 34-35) sich über Vv. 31-32 hinweg an V. 30 angeschlossen haben soll? In Ps 148 (50-59) mit einer vorexilischen Grundfassung (und späteren Ergänzungen) zu rechnen, verbietet schon die Erkenntnis, daß die letzten Kompositionen des Psalters ausnahmslos spät sind. So sehr es zu begrüßen ist, daß die Einheit von Ps 19 verteidigt wird, so unnötig ist die Ausscheidung von Vv. 12-15 (70f). In Ps 74 ist V. 2b mit dem Blick auf V. 3 unentbehrlich (zu 129, Anm. 19). Zu Ps 78 (133-150), der m.E. als einheitliche Komposition den abgeschlossenen Pentateuch voraussetzt, sei nur angemerkt (gegen 135, Anm. 5), daß die Zornesreaktion von Ps 78,21 (vgl. Num 11,10; nicht 11,1!) durchaus an der richtigen Stelle steht, nämlich *vor* dem gnädigen Handeln von Vv. 22-29 (entspricht Num 11,31-35). Die zweite Zornesreaktion von Ps 78,30f erfolgt *nach* dem gnädigen Handeln und entspricht Num 11,33. In Ps 8 dürfte sich das Entfernen von V. 4ab' und 4bb' doch wohl selbst richten (zu 230). Das gleiche gilt mit Bezug auf Ps 22,4-6 (gegen 242f), wie immer der heilsgeschichtliche Einschlag dieser Verse zu erklären ist.

Zu sonstigen Einzelheiten: In Ps 93,4 *mišbārîm* durch *šaebaer* zu ersetzen (180f, Anm. 3), war kein glücklicher Gedanke. Daß *kisse' kâbôd* in 1 Sam 2,8 und Jes 22,23 gegenüber Jer 14,21 und 17,12 semantisch sekundär sein soll (222, Anm. 4), ist schwer verständlich zu machen. Corrigenda: S. 21, Anm. 3, Z. 3: Ps 57,5; S. 134, Anm. 2, Z. 1 v.u.: V. 8 statt V. 9; S. 302: Metzger, M. versehentlich unter Mettinger.

Pt Damiaanstraat 38
NL-6369 SV Simpelveld

Joachim BECKER

Graham OGDEN, *Qoheleth* (Readings—A New Biblical Commentary). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1987. 236 p. 22 × 14.

A good Old Testament commentary is considered to be one from which the reader seeks not primarily new and original hypotheses but rather reliable information as to the various views expounded with regard to the Old Testament book on which the commentary is written. He also wishes to be informed as to the extent and limitations of the available knowledge on the subject. In this respect Graham Ogden's exposition of *Qoheleth* does not attempt to be a typical commentary but concentrates from the very outset on the interpretation and exposition of two key terms: *hebel* and *yitrôn*. On the basis of his interpretation of these two terms — one which is in many respects original — the author attempts to demonstrate the basic intentions of the entire book of *Qoheleth*. Throughout the entire commentary the two

key terms and the problems associated with them appear with frequency, even in many passages where the terms themselves do not occur.

Although Ogden's book is different from many typical commentaries on Qoheleth, in one respect it follows the general procedure adopted by expositors. Almost every expositor attempts to find his own key to solving the problems relating to the book. Ogden's keys are *yitrôn* and *hebel*. At the same time commentators arrive at a basic solution, opting for a particular interpretation: the author of Qoheleth is either a pessimist, determinist and sceptic or an optimist and a realist. Those who favour pessimism and scepticism are at present in the majority (e.g. H. Gunkel, O. Eissfeldt, C. C. Forman, J. Pedersen, K. Galling, G. von Rad, A. Lauha), but the supporters of optimism and realism seem to be increasing in number (e.g. R. Gordis, H. L. Ginsberg, H. W. Hertzberg, O. Loretz, N. Lohfink). It is quite clear that the above categories do not do justice to the author of Qoheleth, since they are laden with the ballast of later times and reflect the viewpoint of modern man. Thus they are better applied to the overall interpretation or viewpoint of the expositor of Qoheleth. Support for all these points of view is, however, to be found in Qoheleth itself. It depends on the expositor as to which aspect he wishes to emphasize. With respect to the overall interpretation of the book, it would seem to be of decisive importance whether the expositor regards the book as written by one sage who makes contradictory statements, or as expressing very pessimistic attitudes toward the options open to one individual in his life, with later slight additions, improvements and corrections by another hand in order to bring the views expressed in line with orthodox, traditional views and thus make the book "presentable at court". The introduction and epilogue, of course, form a quite separate addition to the book of Qoheleth.

Graham Ogden's view of Qoheleth might be called an optimistic one. He takes the view that the person responsible for the contents of the book, with the exception of the introduction and epilogue, is a single sage who is not always consistent. In spite of his self-contradiction the aim of Qoheleth is nevertheless to find a positive purpose in life. Ogden considers that the purpose of the book is to be found in seeking an answer to the programmatic question: What is a man's *yitrôn* "advantage" (1,3; 2,22; 3,9; 5,16; 6,11)? Qoheleth invites the younger generation to ponder profoundly the questions of life to which there appear to be no final answers. Since it is often demonstrable that there is no "advantage" (*yitrôn*) in this life, Wisdom gives the following advice: "Hold fast to life, see it as a gift of God and enjoy it in all its mysteriousness". Many other expositors share in one way or another the same view of the purpose of Qoheleth (e.g. E. Glasser, E. Good, T. Polk, H. Witzernath). However, Ogden adds his own observation on the basic proposition and purpose of the book: since in this life man rarely has any "advantage", *yitrôn* extends to life after death, particularly in the case of the wise and pious. Thus, according to Ogden, Qoheleth is the earliest document among the Old Testament books to expound the germinal thought that there is something beyond death, at least for the wise. Qoheleth represents the first steps taken in the religion of the people of Israel from a purely temporal view of life

towards the possibility of a life after death. Here Ogden takes a quite different line from most other expositors of Qoheleth, who take the view that for Qoheleth there is nothing after death; death is the absolute end of life (e.g. N. Lohfink, *Kohelet* [1980] 6). For Qoheleth the longing for immortality is at most the hope that a man's memory and name should live in future generations (O. Loretz, *Qohelet und der alte Orient* [1964] 300), but even that hope does not materialize (9,5).

It is true that the aspect of death governs and determines the approach to the subject, and death is one of the main themes in the book of Qoheleth. But while Qoheleth finds no "advantage" (*yitrôn*) in this life, nor is *yitrôn* related to material possessions, it does not follow that *yitrôn* extends beyond death and that it is non-material by Qoheleth's criteria, as Ogden thinks (84). Qoheleth himself propounds the view that material money and wisdom are an "advantage" (*yôter*, *yitrôn*), but only for those who "see the sun", i.e. are alive (7,11-12). There is, then, some "advantage" in this life, and if *this* "advantage" is typical of Qoheleth's irony, that it to say, wisdom and money are equally unreliable (thus A. Lauha, *Kohelet* [1978] 128), it does not follow that true *yitrôn* is to be found only beyond death. If something is *yitrôn*, it is to be found only in this life (wisdom?), but Qoheleth finds no clear "advantage" (*yitrôn*) to distinguish poor from rich, wise from fool, man from animal. Since no one crosses the frontier of death, no one has any "advantage" (*yitrôn*) in comparison with anyone else. The fate that awaits everyone is death. Therefore Qoheleth extols the dead as more fortunate than the living, since the dead have passed through the torments of death; but most fortunate of all is he who never needs to be born (4,2-3). If *yitrôn* came after death, the most fortunate would be the deceased wise and pious person, not the foetus that dies in its mother's womb. Qoheleth does not necessarily seek life or "advantage" (*yitrôn*) after this life is concluded, as Ogden thinks, but merely *states* that there is no "advantage". If there were a factor that separated men in death or thereafter, it would certainly be something like *yitrôn*. Since, however, there is no such factor, *yitrôn* is not related to life after death. In my view, not even 12,7 theorizes as to the possibility of *yitrôn* after death (207), any more than do e.g. Gen 2,7 and 3,19. Qoheleth himself (3,21) even casts doubt on the statement made in 12,7. For Qoheleth *yitrôn* may be something unattainable, the ideal good, which appears to fall to no one's lot. But the fact that no one attains it, does not make it something that transcends the limitations of this life (116). Nor does Qoheleth seem to yearn, long or seek for anything; rather he states: No man has any "advantage" (*yitrôn*) over another man or animal. The only slight "advantage" might be wisdom, but in reality not even that is an "advantage".

The other key term, *hebel*, is also discussed thoroughly by Ogden. He commendably examines the various contexts in which *hebel* appears and attempts to depict the kind of situation or circumstances referred to by this word. While most scholars consider that *hebel* has a negative connotation, its best-known translation equivalent being the Latin word *vanitas*, Ogden emphasizes that in no sense does *hebel* express "vanity" or "meaningless". *Hebel* means, according to Ogden, the enigmatic, mysterious and

inexplicable. There are many questions in life to which there are no answers, nor are any answers to be expected. The sign of wisdom is that one accepts this enigma and receives God's gifts of life with gratitude.

If *vanitas* with its connotations is quite too simple an equivalent for translating *hebel*, neither does Ogden's translation "enigma" solve the problem. Ogden quite rightly refers to J. Barr's work in emphasizing that a word receives its meaning from the context (18), but himself fails to observe this principle and attempts to relate and apply the meaning "enigma" to almost every context. At the same time Ogden creates a perhaps unintentional picture of Qoheleth as a writer who observes life and notes many things of a clearly negative nature but who is wary of expressing his own opinion. Everything is simply enigmatic. It is as if a person who cannot or dare not express his opinion were to reply enigmatically to his questioners: "How interesting!" It may, of course, be that the writer of Qoheleth is such a colourless person that he good-naturedly notes the wrongs of life but resigns himself to them: "Such things happen. One must accept that fact, because there is nothing that an individual can do about it. So a person must find pleasure in what he can get as an individual: eating, drinking and enjoying God's gifts in life". Perhaps in its day this was wisdom, but nowadays it might be called egoism, indifference or some kind of frustration.

Ogden quite correctly emphasizes that just as the word *yitrôn* has its own meaning and function in Qoheleth's language, so does the word *hebel* (22-23). Although the translation equivalent "enigma" is quite suitable in some passages, it does not fit every occurrence. When Qoheleth uses synonymous parallelism to describe how joy is *hebel* and laughter is *m^ehôlal* (2,1-2), in neither case is there anything enigmatic, mysterious or inexplicable. There is just as little enigmatic (*hebel*) in Qoheleth's declaration that he hates (*šn*) life because everything in it is evil and wrong (2,17). Qoheleth describes many things as oppression (4,1), misfortune, evil (6,1) and wickedness (3,16). He seems, nevertheless, to express an opinion. Even Ogden considers that Qoheleth was firmly on the side of justice and wisdom, whatever it might cost (116). Therefore for Qoheleth wrong is wrong, not an enigma. What may be enigmatic is that wrong is so widespread! Thus one might ask whether a better translation equivalent or meaning for *hebel* would not be, e.g., 1) "wrong", "injustice" (2,19ff; 4,4; 6,2; 8,10; 8,14; 9,1ff), 2) "vanity", "purposelessness" (2,11.23.26; 4,7f; 5,6.9; 6,4.9.11; 7,6), 3) "transitoriness" (3,19; 4,16; 6,12; 11,8.10), rather than "enigma". "Enigma" fits well in 9,9, for example, but just as suitable here would be "transitoriness". The contexts in which *hebel* appears seem mostly negative rather than simply enigmatic. Ogden himself notes the clearly negative connotation of the word *hebel* in certain passages (e.g. 2,21; 6,11), but the majority of occurrences he still interprets as "positive" wonder: Life is full of enigmas to which only God knows the answer. Therefore the wise man does not ask too many questions but enjoys the gifts of God and attempts to teach others to be reconciled and adopt the attitude towards life of the "sage".

Graham Ogden has carefully and thoroughly examined the problems of Qoheleth in numerous articles prior to this commentary. He is acquainted with Chinese wisdom, as the excursus at the end of the book demonstrates.

On many points one may agree with Ogden's interpretation of the sage and of the wisdom of Qoheleth in particular, but the key to the overall interpretation sought by Ogden does not appear to be the terms *yitrôn* and *hebel*. It may well be that for the expositor the finding of such a key would be *yitrôn*, while the quest for it is *hebel* in the sense intended by Qoheleth.

Pelimannintie 21 D 20
00420 Helsinki
Finland

Risto LAUHA

Willem VAN DER MEER, *Oude woorden worden nieuw: de opbouw van het boek Joël*. Kampen, J. H. Kok, 1989. x-346 p. 16 × 24. Dfl. 49,50.

This study was submitted as a doctoral thesis at the *Theologische Academie* of the *Johannes Calvijnstichting* at Kampen, Holland. The promoter was E. Noort, currently of Hamburg. Van der Meer's thesis is one of the most extensive studies of the book of Joel yet to be published. It seeks to answer one of the perennial key questions of Joel scholarship, namely that concerning the structure and unity of the book.

In his introductory chapter Van der Meer reviews the *Forschungsgeschichte* of the book with special reference to two recent attempts at establishing the unity of Joel (W. S. Prinsloo, *The theology of the book of Joel* [Berlin 1985]; O. Loretz, *Regenritual und Jahwetag im Joelbuch* [Altenberge 1986]). At the same time he expounds his own methodology: that of determining the unity of the book by means of formal, objective criteria. Following J. C. de Moor, Van der Meer identifies the following poetic units: foot, colon, verse, strophe, canticle and canto. The verse is of primary importance for the construction of poetic units. External parallelism and markers of separation within the text help to determine which verses cohere to form strophes. The next step is to discern the progressively larger units — canticles and cantos. A canticle comprises one or more strophes, while a canto consists of one or more canticles. The interrelationship of the various cantos then has to be established as a basis for determining the synchronic structure of the book of Joel. However, in order to establish whether this final structure has been the fixed form of the book all along, one has to scrutinise the diachronic features of the content of the text internally. In the second chapter Van der Meer applies his methodology to a formal analysis of the book in order to determine its structure. The third chapter consists of a detailed analysis of the content. Then, in the fourth chapter, Van der Meer, on the basis of these analyses, draws the following conclusions concerning the unity, structure and development history of the book of Joel: He observes a certain growth process in the book. Its core (that is, the first phase of development) consists of 1,5-12; 1,13-20; 2,18-19c; 2,21-24 and 3,1.3-5b. In this first phase the emergency caused by the drought and the accompanying locust plague

features prominently, a situation associated with the Yom Yahweh. Van der Meer dates this core to the 8th/7th century BC. In the second phase new elements were added to the core (1,2-4; 2,1-14; 2,15-17; 2,19d-20; 3,2.5c; 4,1 [excluding 4,1aC]-3 and 4,9-17); in addition the book was linked with a new situation, namely a threatening foe. Van der Meer dates this phase to the end of the 7th or early 6th century. The Yom Yahweh is no longer described in general terms but is depicted specifically, and there is a new emphasis on the presence of God as taught in Zion theology. Phase three is represented by 4,1aC; 4,4-8 and 4,18-21. In this phase the enemy emerges concretely from the situation of the destruction and exile of Judah. On the basis of this development Van der Meer sees the final structure as a triptych:

- (1) Cantos A (1,2-12), B (1,13-20) and C (2,1-14)
- (2) Canto D (2,15-27)
- (3) Cantos E (3,1-4,8) and F (4,9-21).

The first panel describes the impending disaster. The summons to fast and God's response to this are focal in the second. In the third panel the focus shifts to the future.

Van der Meer has made a significant contribution to Joel scholarship generally, and to the problem of the book's unity and structure in particular. The study is all the more valuable for its extensive bibliography and the dialogue with other scholars which is conducted throughout. Another significant contribution is Van der Meer's detailed formal analysis of the book. In this regard it is noteworthy that Van der Meer concentrates mainly on the identification and discussion of internal and external parallelisms. One might ask whether he should not have devoted more attention to other poetic devices in the book, such as alliteration, assonance, simile and hyperbole. One could ask the same question with regard to morphological and syntactic issues. Although the substantive analysis (chapter 3) occasionally assumes the form of a commentary on the book of Joel, it attests to thorough research and the author's searching knowledge of the book. Future scholars will certainly have to take note of this section.

The critical question, however, is whether Van der Meer presents a plausible reconstruction of the structure and development of the book. In this regard I should like to comment briefly. The structure of the book proposed by Van der Meer is determined by his pericope divisions (Van der Meer uses the term "cantos"). If these should change, it would cast doubt on the overall structure of the book proposed by Van der Meer. This is my main problem with Van der Meer's study, namely the way he relies mainly on the *s^etumā* and *p^etuḥā* to demarcate the cantos. While not denying either the pre-Massoretic character or the importance of the *s^etumā* and *p^etuḥā*, one has to enquire whether the *s^etumā* and *p^etuḥā* can in fact be used to demarcate cantos (pericopes) in the literary sense of the word, and furthermore, whether the *s^etumā* and *p^etuḥā* can be used for this purpose counter to the indications of all other criteria. Some examples may be cited to illustrate the untenability of Van der Meer's use of the *s^etumā* and *p^etuḥā*

to demarcate his cantos: how can one start a new canto at 1,13 when the imperatives and the accompanying motivating ׃ in 1,13ff are a continuation of the same feature in the preceding verses? And how can one start a new canto at 1,13 when there is a discernible chiasmic relation between 1,8-10; 1,11-12 and 1,13-14? (See Prinsloo, *Joel*, 23). At 1,15 a new theme — the Yom Yahweh — emerges; the imperatives of the preceding verses are interrupted; and the *Gattung* of the preceding section (a call for a national lament) also changes in 1,15ff. Yet despite all these arguments Van der Meer decides, largely on the strength of the absence of the *s^etumā* and *p^etuḥā*, not to have a new canto start at 1,15. There can be little doubt that 2,1-11 forms a distinct unit: the *inclusio* effected by the Yom Yahweh terminology in 2,1 and 2,11 indicates a complete unit; the content, too, is unified in its description of the “army”; in addition the *Gattung* of 2,1-11 — one could call it an *Alarmbefehl* — also sets it apart from the preceding and succeeding pericopes. Yet Van der Meer decides, largely on the strength of the *p^etuḥā*, to start a new canto at 2,15. It seems that in his demarcation Van der Meer does not make sufficient allowance for the *Gattung*. These examples illustrate the dubiousness of Van der Meer’s demarcation of his cantos, and hence of his conception of the structure of the book.

I should also like to comment on Van der Meer’s view of the development history of the book. As mentioned, he associates each new addition to the book of Joel with a changed situation, regarding the new additions as new actualisations. Although this aspect of Van der Meer’s study could be considered creative, I nonetheless find it highly speculative. In most instances he is dealing not with the text, but with a (hypothetical) situation underlying it. He himself acknowledges at certain points that the historical situation is not at all certain (cf. e.g. p. 259) and is based on surmise (cf. e.g. p. 171). Some examples can be cited to illustrate my point: In order to substantiate his reconstruction of the situation in what he considers to be the second phase, Van der Meer has to treat the danger depicted in 2,1-11 as an actual hostile army (cf. e.g. p. 166). Consequently he regards 2,1-11 as a metaphoric description of the locusts, which represent this hostile army. A careful reading of 2,1-11 indicates, however, that this is a metaphoric description (actually it would be more correct to call it a simile) of an army. This is underscored by the military terminology in the pericope. The point is that this is not a description of an actual army, but a comparison of something else to an army (cf. especially 2,5c, “like a countless host in battle array” (*NEB*) — note the frequent use of the particle ׃ in this passage. In view of the overall context of the book and the parallels between 2,1-11 and chapter 1 (cf. Prinsloo, *Joel*, 40) the only logical conclusion is that the locusts are here being likened to a hostile army. Hence we are not dealing with a hostile army, as Van der Meer would have it, but with a locust plague. Such a conclusion casts doubt on Van der Meer’s reconstruction of the development history of the book. Another example is Van der Meer’s use of the references to Tyre, Sidon, Philistia and Greece in 4,4-8 to argue that this passage, which is placed in what he regards as the third phase, may be dated to the period round 587/6 BC. In

reality, however, it is not as easy as Van der Meer makes it out to be to pin the above references down to 587/6 (cf. especially p.216). The point I am trying to make is that the construction of the book did not necessarily follow the pattern proposed by Van der Meer.

Without denigrating the fine scholarly standard of Van der Meer's thesis it would seem that his view of the structure and development of the book is not really convincing. Although one has to concede Van der Meer's point that one needs to study the book of Joel both synchronically and diachronically in order to understand it, it is questionable whether he himself properly combines the two approaches in his own study.

The final word on the problem of the structure of the book of Joel has not been spoken. Van der Meer has made a significant contribution to the discussion, however, which should be duly acknowledged.

Department of Old Testament
University of Pretoria
South Africa

Willem S. PRINSLOO

Novum Testamentum

Ronald A. PIPER, *Wisdom in the Q Tradition. The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 61). Cambridge-New York, Cambridge University Press, 1989. ix-325 p. 14,3 × 22,3. £30.00/\$49.50.

The presence of sapiential forms in the Jesus tradition has been widely acknowledged, but until now widely ignored. As early as 1832 Schleiermacher called the Sermon on the Mount a gnomologium and at the beginning of the twentieth century it was common enough to compare Q with the book of Proverbs. Nevertheless, aphoristic forms did not emerge as a major area of research until the relatively recent works of William Beardslee, Dominic Crossan and Dieter Zeller and it was not until James M. Robinson's essay in the 1964 Bultmann Festschrift ("ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q", *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann* [Tübingen 1964] 77-96) that the significance of Q's sapiential genre came to be appreciated.

Ronald Piper's 1986 University of London dissertation, written under C. F. Evans and Graham Stanton, provides a fresh view on two important topics: the compositional features of wisdom materials in the double tradition and the relationship between sapiential and prophetic or apocalyptic configurations in Q. Both are pressing issues and their significance reaches beyond Q studies as such to basic issues in the way in which we imagine Christian origins.

Piper begins with five clusters of aphoristic sayings (Q/Luke 6,37-42; 6,43-45; 11,9-13; 12,2-9 and 12,22-31 and parallels), showing in each

instance that “[t]hese are not haphazard collections of aphoristic sayings; they display a design and argument unique in the synoptic tradition” (64). According to Piper these clusters exhibit a consistent, four-part structure: (1) each begins with an admonition with a wide or general appeal followed by (2) a supporting maxim; (3) the following section, usually taking the form of a double rhetorical question, introduces new imagery; and (4) a final saying narrows the original general sapiential insight to a specific issue. Thus, for example, a general warning against judging (Q/Luke 6,37) is referred specifically to the hypocrisy implicit in criticizing one’s brother (6,41-42) and the initial admonition concerning anxiety over material goods (Q/Luke 12,22) is interpreted by appealing to the fatherhood of God and by an admonition to seek the kingdom (12,29-31).

There are other common denominators. Each of these collections is constructed to persuade rather than to command or proclaim. Arguments are based on an experiential appeal: the transactions of human families (Q/Luke 11,11-12) or simple observation of nature (12,24-28), for example. Each of the collections appears to have been directed at Christian groups rather than at outsiders and accordingly there is little evidence of polemical interests. This characterization of Q’s rhetorical mode is in sharp contrast to that offered by S. Schulz (*Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* [Zürich 1972]), who emphasizes the enthusiastic and prophetic dimension of the sayings, and that argued more recently by M. Sato (*Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q* [diss. Bern 1984; Tübingen 1988]), who has made a case for understanding Q as a prophetic book. Nevertheless, Piper has the better arguments, at least on the five collections he surveys. Schulz’s view is based upon interpreting the λέγω ὑμῖν and τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν formulae as prophetic-apocalyptic and even by maintaining that some “prophetic” λέγω ὑμῖν formulae were originally in Q but have dropped out (e.g., at Q/Luke 6,37). This is a slender basis for characterizing Q as prophetic, however, since neither formula necessarily belongs to prophetic speech and τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν more usually functions to introduce an appeal to experiential wisdom. Equally unconvincing is Sato’s assertion that “specifically prophetic speech elements” such as ‘fear not’ (!) and the second person plural have the effect of transforming originally sapiential sayings into prophetic ones.

Piper extends his search for structured sapiential collections to Q/Luke 6,27-28.31-36, where he finds a very similar four-part construction, but only by arguing that Matthew’s order best represents Q and that Q/Luke 6,36 is the conclusion of the cluster instead of the opening of the following unit (as Schürmann and others have proposed). His tentative suggestion that Q/Luke 16,9-13 belongs to Q, based on the presence of the same four-part structure and the possibility that Matt 6,19-24 betrays some knowledge of these sayings, is less convincing, although 16,13 of course derives from Q.

Finally, he turns to other aphoristic compounds (Q/Luke 6,29-30; 12,33b-34; 12,58-59; 13,23-24; 17,3b-4) and isolated aphorisms (Q/Luke 6,40; 10,2.7b; 11,33.34-36; 14,34-35) which, although they do not exhibit the same four-part structure, cohere with the themes present in the structured collections. And like the structured collections, these units are directed at

community members rather than at outsiders; they intend to persuade rather than command; and persuasion has an experiential basis. This, interestingly, contrasts with Marcan aphorisms which generally lack an experiential appeal and are more likely to invoke apocalyptic spectres of reward and punishment as motivations (116, 136). He also notes that while Mark is concerned to underline the uniqueness of Jesus, the wisdom materials in Q/Luke 11,14-23 and 7,24-35 subordinate this concern to the more general interest in offering "reasons for accepting his *genuineness* as one who represents God's kingdom" (123).

It is not always clear that the "structured collections" are quite as neatly arranged as Piper suggests. The four-part structure depends upon at least debatable divisions of Q materials and, in the case of Q/Luke 6,37-42, on the exclusion of 6,40. The reason which Piper adduces for the originality of the Lukan position of 6,39 — in effect, that it is more difficult than Matthew's placement — could be (and has been) used to defend the originality of the position of 6,40. To quibble with one or other of Piper's conclusions does not, however, diminish the importance of his main discovery: that the mode of Q's rhetoric coheres with sapiential rather than prophetic or apocalyptic strategies. Even if the structures of the sapiential clusters in Q are more variable than Piper allows, these collections display a remarkable degree of thematic coherence and agreement in rhetorical posture. For this reason he rightly challenges the conclusion of A.D. Jacobson ("Wisdom Christology in Q", Ph.D. Diss. Claremont Graduate School, 1978) that Q/Luke 11,9-13; 12,2-9 and 12,22-31 ought to be relegated to a late redaction. And although Piper did not engage Sato's 1984 dissertation, his conclusions would likewise tell against Sato's suggestion that the Q material found in Luke 11,2-4.9-13; 12,2-12.22-31.33-34 were "unmotivated" or late additions to Q. Their thematic and general structural coherence shows that they belong together with 6,37-42, which undoubtedly belong to the formative stages of Q. Piper is also quite right in noting the Torah plays no role in undergirding admonitions and that imminent eschatological awareness is not on the horizon of these admonitions.

Piper's conclusions display remarkable parallels to those of this reviewer's completely independent study, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia 1987). Both Piper and Kloppenborg argue that wisdom language and wisdom forms have profoundly influenced the argumentative structures of Q. The implication of both works is that we need to reassess (and reject) characterizations of Q as a "random collection of sayings" and as a thoroughly apocalyptic work. Neither Torah nor apocalypticism is at the heart of Q's vision (see J.S. Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q", *HTR* 80 [1987] 287-306). This also implies that it was quite possible to organize the Jesus tradition by means of wisdom forms and genres and that apocalyptic imagery and rhetoric is not necessarily intrinsic to the earliest stages of the tradition.

Piper's final chapter deals with the interaction between the aphoristic components of Q and those pericopae which connect Lady Wisdom with

the deuteronomistic motif of the sending of the prophets and their violent rejection by Israel (e.g., Q/Luke 11,49-51). He recognizes the natural affinities between wisdom language and the appeal to heavenly Sophia, but only implicitly grasps that the two types of discourse function at different levels. It should be clear that heavenly Sophia operates at the level of rationalization not of individual teachings, but of the *ethos* (in a rhetorical sense) of Jesus, John and their followers. In this respect, the Sophia-Deuteronomistic materials belong to a more self-conscious moment — whether that is secondary in stratigraphical terms is another matter — which reflects on the ultimate legitimacy not of this or that counsel, but of the entire enterprise. This also comes into view, e.g., at Q/Luke 12,8-9; 11,14-23.

This raises again Robinson's suggestion that the inclusion of sayings in a λόγοι σοφῶν genre encouraged the association of Jesus with Sophia. While accepting Robinson's generic designation, Piper asserts that there is "little direct evidence in the double tradition to show that Jesus was understood Christologically as Sophia's representative *because he spoke in proverbs*" (175, emphasis original). This does not attend sufficiently to the dynamics of wisdom genres in general. As Kloppenborg has shown, wisdom genres commonly legitimated their contents by associating the sage with Wisdom or Ma'at either by having the sage transmit a first-person speech of Sophia (Prov 8; Sir 24) or by describing the union of Sophia with the sage (Wis 8,2-9,18) or by directly identifying the speaker with Sophia (Gospel of Thomas). This dynamic is due to the "anthropology" of wisdom: wisdom is immanent in those who speak with wisdom (cf. Wis 7,27).

At a few other points, Piper takes too limited a view of wisdom, as if wisdom texts always treat "religious" topics and always display a "metaphorical openness" in their forms (113). If Piper had looked at wisdom more broadly, he would have seen that wisdom admonitions can be quite prosaic; the admonition on reconciliation in Q/Luke 17,3-4 is scarcely atypical of Near Eastern wisdom, either in form or content. Similarly, when Piper asserts that the attention given to interior qualities in Q/Luke 6,43-45 is not typical of wisdom (50), he overlooks the great stress placed upon the internalization of wisdom by sage in both Hebrew (Sir 39,1-11) and Egyptian wisdom traditions. This only means that Q is even more typically sapiential than Piper thinks, and thus confirms rather than negates his general thesis.

More debatable is his suggestion that the tradents of Q could be associated with the Stephen group, a suggestion made earlier by T. Boman, *Die Jesus-Überlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde* (Göttingen 1967). Piper's case is based on the facts that both Q and the "Hellenists" were concerned with the problems of basic necessities for existence, both experienced persecution at the hands of Jewish authorities, both invoked the deuteronomistic motif of the killing of the prophets and that Solomon figures importantly in both Q and in Stephen's speech (Acts 7,47-50). Yet Piper's surmise is rendered doubtful by the uncertainties associated with Luke's reference to the distribution of food in Acts, the fact that Q does not

associate Solomon with Temple-building but with wisdom and his proverbial wealth and the fact that Q does not (as Acts) propose an alternate Temple "made without hands" but is instead satisfied to proclaim the abandonment of the Temple in Jerusalem (Luke 13,34-35).

These few hesitations notwithstanding, *Wisdom in the Q Tradition* represents a sound accomplishment and a significant contribution to the growing bibliography on Q and Christian origins.

University of St. Michael's College
81 St. Mary Street
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 1J4

John S. KLOPPENBORG

Carol Kern STOCKHAUSEN, *Moses' Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant* (Analecta Biblica 116). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989. IX-199 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 40.500.

"2 Co est incontestablement la plus difficile des lettres de Paul, son argumentation est fréquemment obscure pour le lecteur moderne, son contenu n'est pas familier, sa construction apparemment faite au petit bonheur, son *Sitz im Leben* brumeux" (2); C. K. S. montre comment les commentateurs ont été fascinés par quelques-unes des difficultés de 2 Co: 5,1-10; 5,16-21; 12,7, et note que même si l'on admet une multiplicité de lettres, ces difficultés ne sont pas résolues pour autant (6).

Une autre approche dont la multiplicité des solutions montre la complexité est celle de l'identification des adversaires de Paul.

C. K. S. veut aborder 3,1-4,6 dont 3,6; 3,17 avec son contexte 3,16 et 3,18 lui semblent particulièrement difficiles. Quelle est la nature de 3,7-18? Est-ce un midrash tiré d'Ex 34,29-35? Peut-on en reconstituer la source? (13). Après avoir décrit la situation de la recherche avec une grande densité et une belle précision, C. K. S. détermine le but (14-16), la structure (16-18) et surtout les présupposés (18-30) de son étude. Ce paragraphe est le plus important de l'introduction: C. K. S. situe Paul au cœur du christianisme primitif, comme Juif, influencé par l'Hellénisme et le Pharisaïsme; C. K. S. note l'intérêt porté à l'actualisation de la prophétie (20) ainsi qu'aux pères: Adam, Enoch, Noé, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moïse. Ce dernier est crédité de bien des traits extraordinaires dans l'*Assomption de Moïse*. Les différentes méthodes d'interprétation biblique attirent l'attention de C. K. S., car ce sont elles qui permettront le mieux de comprendre Paul, ses types de raisonnement et d'explication. Les deux règles de base de l'exégèse rabbinique, le *Kal va-homer* et la *gezera shava*, sont utilisées par Paul en 2 Co 3,1-18. Ce sont les deux premières règles des 7 de Hillel qui font aussi partie des 19 de Rabbi Yshmaél. Le *kal va-homer* est un raisonnement qui va du simple au complexe et inversement, c'est une sorte d'*a fortiori*; la *gezera shava* est un principe d'analogie par lequel la Tora recourt aux mêmes termes en deux passages différents. C'est un moyen qui tantôt atténue, tantôt aggrave la prescription. Principes utiles pour comprendre 2 Co 3,1-4,6. Reste le *pesher*

où l'interprétation relève directement de la vie de la communauté (28-30). En bref C. K. S. voit en Paul un Juif de son temps, converti à Jésus-Christ, qui s'est engagé à prêcher l'évangile, mais qui a aussi eu recours à des éléments tirés de la tradition biblique du passé pour expliquer cette nouvelle expérience religieuse (32).

Ch. 1: 2 Co 3,1-6 (33-86). En se référant à Jr 31 (LXX 38), 31-34, Paul se décrit lui-même comme un fidèle chrétien et un apôtre sur le modèle de Moïse. Il est le porteur de l'alliance exactement comme l'était Moïse. Mais l'alliance de Paul est radicalement différente de celle qu'apportait Moïse et, de ce fait, son apostolat a un sens tout différent de celui du modèle mosaïque. Ce pivot de l'argument paulinien est précisément la base des reproches qui lui sont adressés: sa compétence lui vient directement de Dieu. Donc des lettres de recommandation sont superflues (41-42). La comparaison contrastée avec Moïse continue en 2 Co 3,7-4,6. De la p. 42 à la p. 71, C. K. S. entreprend méthodiquement la reconstruction de l'arrière-plan exégétique de 2 Co 3,1-6 et examine successivement: *nouvelle alliance* (43-47), *cœur de chair* (47-49), *tables de pierre* (49-51), *gravée sur vos cœurs* (51-53) pour conclure que ce vocabulaire inhabituel vient de textes de la LXX: Jr 38,31-34; Ez 11,19 et 36,26; et Ex 34,1-4.27-28. Sur cette base, C. K. S. poursuit son investigation pour voir s'il ne s'agirait pas de l'application de la *gezera shava*. Ainsi Jr 38,31s est associé avec Ez 11,16s; Jr 38,33 avec Ez 11,19 avec pour terme commun *cœur*; les chaînons verbaux font alors l'objet d'une analyse plus poussée où Ex 34,1-4 (en chaînon avec Jr 38 et Jr 39) est en parallèle avec Ex 36,21 (en chaînon avec Ez 11 et Ez 36). Dans le premier cas, *graphô* permet de passer d'Ex 34 à Jr 38 et les parallèles *diathèkè* + *kardia* à Jr 39. Dans le second cas, *lithos* permet de passer d'Ex 36 à Ez 11 et 36 (diagramme p. 57). Ces chaînons de mots-crochets forment l'arrière-plan de 2 Co 3,1-6 (58). A l'aide de l'analyse des trois textes: N° 1: Jr 38,31-34; N° 2: Ez 11,19-20; N° 3: Ez 36,26-28, qui ont tous en commun: B- *kainos*; D- *kardia*; G- *laos/theos*, sur une série classifiée de A à J, le texte d'ensemble 1+2+3 (2 Co 3,6) présente tous les éléments (62). Comme évidence supplémentaire C. K. S. ajoute un N° 4: Jr 39 et donc les éléments K. L (*crainte de Dieu* et *éternel*) et retrouve A à L dans le texte d'ensemble (65). Ces indices lui ont permis de discerner que des textes de l'AT se trouvent à l'arrière-plan de la démonstration de Paul. Le vocabulaire inhabituel de Paul est ainsi expliqué par les textes de l'écriture invoqués (71). C. K. S. reprend alors l'argument de 2 Co 3,1-6 à la lumière de l'arrière-plan exégétique: *graphô* sert de charnière avec cet arrière-plan; puis sont soulignés les contrastes (73-82): «écrits sur les cœurs, non sur la pierre»; «connu de tous, non par un seul»; «écrit avec l'Esprit, non avec de l'encre»; «alliance de l'Esprit, non écrite par quelqu'un»; «la lettre tue, mais l'Esprit donne la vie»; «un ministère intérieur, non une administration extérieure».

C. K. S. peut alors brosser sur cette base un tableau de Paul et de Moïse comme ministres d'alliance (82-85), montrer leur compétence (*hikanotès*) ou leur capacité. Nous aurions beaucoup à dire sur ce point (voir notre étude, M. Carrez, «*Hikanotès*: 2 Co 2,14-17», *Paolo, ministro del Nuovo Testamento* [Roma 1987] 79-104). Alors C. K. S. souligne en quoi Paul répond à ses critiques en notant les implications de 2 Co 3,1-6.

Ch. 2: 2 Co 3,7-18 (87-153). C. K. S. commence dans une introduction par donner sa propre traduction, agrémentée de nombreuses remarques et précisions (87-91), puis expose la méthode et les buts de sa recherche (91-94). 2 Co 3,7-18 est alors comparé systématiquement avec Ex 34,29-35 (95-109). Tout d'abord (95-97) la traduction d'Ex 34,29-35 permet une mise en valeur des points de contact entre Ex 34,29-35 et 2 Co 3,7-18 (97-109). *Doxa* et *kalumma* appartiennent aux deux textes, puis la relation Moïse et Fils d'Israël permet de préciser l'interpénétration des deux textes. Mais pourquoi Ex 34,29-35? Jr 38,31-32 (LXX) se réfère aussi à l'alliance, mais sans qu'il y soit question des pères, et donc sans Moïse, et de plus dans un autre contexte historique. Pour C. K. S., il faut ajouter deux versets (Ex 34,27-28) pour obtenir Ex 34,27-35, de manière à mieux percevoir le lien avec 2 Co. La Figure 4 (diagramme) met en valeur le jeu des mots entre Ex 34,1-4; 34,27-35; 36,21 et Jr 38 et 39 d'une part, Ez 11 et Ez 36 d'autre part.

C. K. S. introduit à la méthodologie exégétique de 2 Co 3,7-18 (109-113) et voit la technique du *kal va-homer* en 2 Co 3,7-11 (Figure 5) et celle du *peshar* en 2 Co 3,16-17. La méthode du *kal va-homer* en 2 Co 3,7-11 (113-122) fait apparaître trois exemples de cette méthode: a) 2 Co 7-8: ministère de mort — ministère de l'Esprit (113-116); 2 Co 3,9-11 en fournit deux autres: b) v. 9: ministère de condamnation — ministère de justice et c) v. 11: ce qui est passer — ce qui demeure. Paul s'est servi de ces trois *kal va-homer* pour mettre en valeur l'appropriation de la gloire et ainsi se situer par rapport à Moïse. 2 Co 3,13-18 comme *peshar* occupe les p. 123-150. a) 2 Co 3,12-13a est une transition, b) 13bc un résumé du ministère de Moïse (il se met un voile sur le visage pour éviter que les Israélites ne voient la fin d'un éclat passager) (125-129 et Figure 6 centrée sur *kalumma* et *prosôpon*). c) 2 Co 3,14-18 comme *peshar* (130-150) constitue l'essentiel. C. K. S. cite tout d'abord J. D. G. Dunn dont elle admet la plupart des conclusions: 3,16-17a est un *peshar* spécifique d'Ex 34,34 et le *pneuma* est identifié au Seigneur de l'AT et non avec Jésus-Christ. La gloire a été transférée à Paul. «Voile» est utilisé métaphoriquement pour l'aveuglement d'Israël (130-131). Comment est-il retiré, de telle sorte que la gloire soit visible non pas d'un seul, ou de quelques-uns, mais de tous? Par l'action de l'Esprit, déjà présent chez Paul après sa conversion au Christ (132-133). C. K. S. traite alors de l'incrédulité d'Israël (133-135), puis examine Is 6,9-10 et son contexte (1-11) (136-140), Is 29,10-12 et son contexte (1-4.10-15) (140-150). La Figure 7 sert de diagramme à l'ensemble sur le jeu des mots *graphô*, *diathèkè*, *doxa*, *pneuma*, *kardia* et *ophthalmos*. C. K. S. voit en 3,18 un sommaire de l'usage que Paul fait d'Ex 34,29-35: «Nous tous, à visage dévoilé, contrairement à Moïse quand il affrontait les fils d'Israël, reflétons la gloire du Seigneur et nous sommes transfigurés en cette même image graduellement comme Moïse le fut quand il se tournait vers le Seigneur, exactement comme nous avons fait maintenant. Nous, comme Moïse, tirons notre gloire du Seigneur. Pour nous, le Seigneur est un Esprit qui donne la vie». C. K. S. conclut en reprenant l'ensemble des résultats qui découlent du *kal va-homer* et du *peshar* (150-153).

Ch. 3: conclusions, questions restées sans réponse, et suggestions pour une recherche supplémentaire (154-177). Tout d'abord Moïse comme modèle

(154-156): libérateur, thaumaturge, médiateur, juge, donateur de lois, prophète et prêtre. La symétrie avec Paul, nouveau Moïse, doit être approfondie. Texte primordial: 2 Co 4,1-6, son rôle comme conclusion (158-167); la correspondance de thèmes avec 2 Co 3,1-18; citations et allusions scripturaires: Gn 1 et Is 9 (160-162); Is 6 (163-167). De plus 2 Co 3-4 a des analogies avec Jn 12,37-43. Puis C. K. S. analyse la conclusion de Paul (167-169) et le rôle de Paul, nouveau Moïse (la miséricorde révélée à Moïse, le voile de Moïse et Paul, second Moïse; 169-175).

C. K. S. a donc mis en évidence la substructure de 2 Co 3,1-4,6. Toutefois elle fait remarquer que le sens du mot *telos* en 2 Co 3,13 n'est pas complètement clarifié. Au fond, quelle est la place réelle de Jésus-Christ dans la pensée de Paul en 2 Co 3-4? Le verset 14 peut avoir plusieurs significations. Pour C. K. S., selon 2 Co 3,14, c'est en Christ que la gloire de Moïse, son ministère et son alliance ont été amenés à leur terme. Il semble donc que C. K. S. adopte la traduction: «il ne leur est pas dévoilé que cette alliance a été menée à son terme (abolie) par Christ» et non pas «le voile n'est pas levé, car c'est en Christ qu'il disparaît». Le fait que cette gloire trouve son terme en Christ est la motivation de son voilement pour Moïse. La présentation du Christ vis-à-vis de Moïse découle donc de la lecture que Paul fait d'Exode. Paul ne définit jamais la gloire, même s'il lui donne une grande extension.

Ici C. K. S. pourrait dans des recherches ultérieures tenir compte du rôle de *doxa* dans la pensée paulinienne (voir notre livre M. Carrez, *De la souffrance à la gloire, le rôle de la doxa dans la pensée paulinienne* [Neuchâtel-Paris 1964]). Les deux emplois de *doxa* en 2 Co 4,4 et 4,6 ne sont pas, à notre avis, suffisamment exploités; on ne voit pas assez combien cette gloire du Christ, qui est image de Dieu (aux deux sens du terme, homme véritable et image véritable du vrai Dieu), a une force singulière qui vient couronner ce que la gloire de Moïse-Paul avait commencé à mettre en valeur. N'y-a-t-il pas dans une structure d'ensemble un passage du moins au plus, une sorte de magistral *kal va-homer*? En résumé, nous avons apprécié les fines analyses de détail, leur pertinence, mais la conclusion nous laisse un peu sur notre faim. C'est cependant une bonne étude dans ses divers contextes.

Avenue Pasteur, 46
F-93100 Montreuil

Maurice CARREZ

Ronald Y. K. FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament). Grand Rapids, MI, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988. XXXIII-342 p.

L'Autore di questo commento, Professore alla China Graduate School of Theology di Hong Kong, è già noto per vari studi concernenti soprattutto il tema della giustificazione in Paolo. L'attuale commento, come egli stesso ci informa, costituisce la rielaborazione e l'ampliamento di un precedente lavoro del genere pubblicato in cinese nel 1982.

Una buona parte delle sue prese di posizione circa Gal si spiega in base al fatto che Fung è stato allievo e ha maturato questa sua impresa sotto la guida del Prof. F.F. Bruce dell'Università di Manchester, che del resto l'Autore riconosce esplicitamente come proprio mentore. Perciò alcune tesi già caratteristiche del commento di Bruce a Gal (cf. in «The New International Greek Testament Commentary» [Exeter 1982]) si ritrovano qui sostanzialmente uguali.

Mi riferisco in particolare alla identificazione geografica della Galazia e delle sue chiese (= regione meridionale, con le chiese del primo viaggio missionario: Antiochia di Pisidia, Iconio, Lистра, Derbe) e alla datazione della lettera (= scritta anteriormente al concilio di Gerusalemme, come la prima delle lettere di Paolo). Queste due tesi sono fin troppo note, essendo state proposte già alla fine del secolo scorso da W.M. Ramsay; e anche la loro confutazione è materia dell'introduzione ai commenti della maggior parte degli Eseteti, che non accettano tali soluzioni (cf. per esempio F. Mussner, U. Borse, B. Corsani): uno degli argomenti maggiori in questo senso, a cui Fung non accenna neanche, è l'accentuata vicinanza tematica di Gal con Rom.

È interessante invece, nel capitolo dedicato al genere letterario di Gal, la critica rivolta alla qualifica di «lettera apologetica» sostenuta da H.D. Betz secondo i canoni della retorica antica; ma Fung non propone in proprio alcun altro tipo di genere letterario. In più, manca una discussione vera e propria circa la struttura della lettera. Di fatto egli articola lo scritto paulino in quattro parti: difesa autobiografica (1,1-2,14), trattazione centrale sulla giustificazione per fede (2,15-5,12 suddivisa in otto sezioni: 2,15-21; 3,1-6; 3,7-14; 3,15-22; 3,23-4,11; 4,12-20; 4,21-5,1; 5,2-12), istruzioni sulla vita cristiana (5,13-6,10), sommario e conclusione (6,11-18). Ma neppure all'inizio delle singole ripartizioni viene offerta alcuna giustificazione sulle cesure adottate, o comunque si riafferma soltanto in breve la scelta operata.

Il commento procede in maniera molto accurata e con l'appoggio di una buona documentazione bibliografica (però sulle visite di Paolo a Gerusalemme in 1,18 e 2,1 non si cita mai lo stimolante lavoro di G. Lüdemann). Alcuni testi decisivi ricevono dal commento un'ottima trattazione: così 2,16; 3,23-29; 5,6. Altri invece lasciano insoddisfatti: così 2,20; 3,10s; 4,21-31 (in quest'ultimo passo Fung ritiene che la polemica dell'Apostolo non sia diretta tanto contro i giudeo-cristiani quanto contro i giudei).

Il commento è arricchito da un Excursus sul rapporto tra indicativo e imperativo, e da un bilancio conclusivo sul tema della «giustificazione per fede» in Gal. Seguono tre Indici: analitico, degli Autori, e biblico.

Pont. Università Lateranense
P. S. Giovanni in Laterano 4
00120 Roma

Romano PENNA

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1989-1990. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 317, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	10	278	19	307
Fac. Orientalistica	—	3	7	10
Universi	10	281	26	317
Nationes	60		Alumni	317
Dioceses	154		Alumni	162
Inst. Religiosorum	51		Alumni	115
Inst. Religiosarum	15		Alumnae	15
Ex statu laicali	25		Alumnae	14
			Alumni	11

Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica dignus declaratus est:

PINTO LEON, Adolfo (16.05.1990). *Lamed y sus relaciones. Indicaciones para su traducción* (Cum laude). Moderator: L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

Ó FEARGHAIL, Feargus, *The Introduction to Luke–Acts. A Study on the Role of Lk 1,1–4,44 in the Composition of Luke’s Two-Volume Work* (extractum). Rome 1990.

PINTO LEON, Adolfo, *Lamed y sus relaciones. Indicaciones para su traducción* (extractum). Roma 1990.

ZESATI ESTRADA, Carlos, *Hebreos 5,7-8. Estudio histórico-exegético* (Analecta Biblica 113). Roma 1990.

Third International A.I.B.I. Conference

The Third International Conference of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique (A.I.B.I.) will be held at Tübingen from the 26th to the 30 of August 1991. It is being organized under the chairmanship of Prof. Dr. Harald Schweizer.

The following topics will be treated during the conference: 1. Interpretation of a specific text; 2. Methodology; 3. Preparation of the text; 4. Software-design/programming; 5. Hermeneutics. Each of the five topics will be treated in lectures and by panel discussions. The conference language will be English.

Registration and accommodation details will be sent out as soon as possible. Conference fees will be around US \$100. For further information please write to:

Prof. Dr. Harald Schweizer
Universität Tübingen
Reutlingerstrasse, 12
D-7400 Tübingen 1 West Germany

Congrès de l'I.O.S.O.T.

Le XIVe Congrès de l'International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament se tiendra à Paris du 19 au 24 juillet 1992 sous la présidence du Professeur A. Caquot. Le secrétaire du Congrès est A. Lemaire. Les suggestions, l'enregistrement et les propositions de titres de communications brèves doivent être adressées à:

A. Lemaire, Congrès IOSOT
Institut d'Etudes Sémitiques
Collège de France
11 Place Marcelin Berthelot
75231 Paris Cedex 05 France

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a *Biblica*, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto juicio acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensionados en *Biblica*.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por *Biblica* no serán devueltos al remitente, aún cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a *Biblica* se trasmiten al Editor del *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Enviense los libros a: Dirección *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia.

Vetus Testamentum

Andersen, Francis I.–Freedman, David Noel, *Amos. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Anchor Bible Series 24A). New York, Doubleday, 1989. XLII-979 p. 16 × 24. \$30.00 USA–\$38.00 Canada.

Beauchamp, Paul, *Leggere la Sacra Scrittura Oggi* (Con quale spirito accostarsi alla Bibbia) (Sorgenti di Vita 19). Milano, Editrice Massimo, 1990. 126 p. 12,8 × 19,8. Lit. 15.000.

Clines, David, J. A., *What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Readerly Questions to the Old Testament* (JSOT Supplement Series 94). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 178 p. 14 × 22. £18.50–\$28.50.

Clines, David J. A., *Job 1–20* (Word Biblical Commentary 17). Irving, Word Books, 1989. CXV-501 p. 16 × 23,5.

Clines, David J. A.–Fowl, Stephen E.–Porter, Stanley E. (eds.), *The Bible in Three Dimensions*. Essays in celebration of forty years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield (JSOT Supplement Series 87). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 408 p. 14 × 22. £35.00–\$50.00.

Gibert, Pierre, *Vérité historique et esprit historien*. L'historien biblique de Gédéon face à Hérodote (Initiations). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1990. 272 p. 13,5 × 21,5. 175 FF.

Goldingay, John, *Approaches to Old Testament Interpretation* (Updated Edition). Leicester, Apollos, 1990. 207 p. 13,5 × 21. £9.95.

Hughes, Jeremy, *Secrets of the Times*. Myth and History in Biblical Chronology (JSOT Supplement Series 66). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. xiv-315 p. 14 × 22. £35.00–\$60.00.

Koopmans, William T., *Joshua 24 as Poetic Narrative* (JSOT Supplement Series 93). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. xv-522 p. 14 × 22. £35.00–\$52.50.

Mazar, Amihai, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible. 10,000 - 586 B.C.E.* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library). New York, Doubleday, 1990. xxx-570 p. 16 × 24. \$30.00.

Moore, Michael S., *The Balaam Traditions*. Their Character and Development (SBL Dissertation Series 113). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1990. xii-157 p. 13,5 × 21,5. Cloth: \$23.95 (\$15.95); paper: \$15.95 (\$10.95).

Niccacci, Alviero, O.F.M., *Un profeta tra oppressori e oppressi*. Analisi esegetica del capitolo 2 di Michea nel piano generale del libro (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum – Analecta 27). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1989. xi-211 p. 16 × 23,5. \$12.00.

Niccacci, Alviero, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* (JSOT Supplement Series 86). Translated by W.G.E. Watson. Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 218 p. 14 × 22. £27.50–\$50.00.

Otzen, Benedikt, *Judaism in Antiquity*. Political Development and Religious Currents from Alexander to Hadrian (JSOT - The Biblical Seminar Series) Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 243 p. 14 × 22. Cloth: £35.00–\$50.00; paper: £9.50–\$15.95.

Patrick, Dale-Scult, Allen, *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation* (JSOT Supplement Series 82) (Bible and Literature Series 26). Sheffield, Almond Press, 1990. 171 p. 14 × 22. £22.50–\$39.50.

Schiffman, Lawrence, H. (ed.), *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin (JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2 - Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha - Supplement Series 8). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 296 p. 14 × 22. £30.00–\$50.00.

Specht, Günther, *Wissensbasierte Analyse althebräischer Morphosyntax*. Das Expertensystem AMOS (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 35). St. Ottilien. EOS Verlag St. Ottilien, 1990. ix-136 p. 14,8 × 21. DM 42.–.

Van der Lingen, Anton, *Les guerres de Yahvé*. L'implication de YHWH dans les guerres d'Israël selon les livres historiques de l'Ancien Testament (Lectio Divina 139). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1990. 280 p. 13,5 × 21,5. 185 FF.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J., *The Old Hebrew Particle «gam»*. A Syntactic-semantic Description of «gam» in Gn–2Kg (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 34). St. Ottilien, Verlag Erzabtei St. Ottilien, 1990. xi-228 p. 14,8 × 21. DM 45.–.

Vetus Latina. Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel. 11/2 *Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*. 3. Lieferung. Sir. Prolog und 1,1-3,31. Edidit Walter Thiele. Freiburg, Herder, 1989. pp. 161-240. 32 × 24.

Novum Testamentum

Blomberg, Craig L., *Interpreting the Parables*. Leicester, Apollos, 1990. 334 p. 15,2 × 22,7. £11.95.

Callan, Terrance (ed.), *Proceedings. Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies*. Volume IX, 1989. New York, Canisius College, 1989. 273 p. 13,8 × 20,8. \$8.00.

Casalini, Nello, ofm, *Libro dell'origine di Gesù Cristo*. Analisi letteraria e teologica di Matt 1-2 (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum - Analecta 28). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1990. 173 p. 16 × 23,5. \$12.00.

Christoffersson, Olle, *The Earnest Expectation of the Creature*. The Flood-Tradition as Matrix of Romans 8:18-27 (Coniectanea Biblica - New Testament Series 23). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990. 174 p. 15,2 × 23,3. SEK 160.-.

Court, John-Court, Kathleen, *The New Testament World*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990. 384 p. 19,5 × 24,5. £19.50.

De La Potterie, Ignace, *The Hour of Jesus*. The Passion and the Resurrection of Jesus According to John. Staten Island, Alba House, 1990. xvi-199 p. 14 × 21. \$12.95.

Kiilunen, Jarmo, *Das Doppelgebot der Liebe in synoptischer Sicht*. Ein redaktionskritischer Versuch über Mk 12,28-34 und die Parallelen (AASF B 250) Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1989. 110 p. 16,5 × 24,5.

Kiilunen, Jarmo, *Die Vollmacht im Widerstreit*. Untersuchungen zum Werdegang von Mk 2,1-3,6. (AASF B Diss. 40). Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1985. v-298 p. 17,5 × 25.

Mack, Burton, L., *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Guide to Biblical Scholarship - New Testament Series). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1990. 110 p. 13,5 × 21,5.

McKnight, Edgar V. (ed.), *Reader Perspectives on the New Testament* (Semeia 48). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. viii-206 p. 15 × 23.

Meynet, Roland, *Avez-vous lu saint Luc?* Guide pour la rencontre (Lire la Bible 88). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1990. 284 p. 18 × 11. FF 120.

Montague, George T., S.M., *Companion God*. A Cross-Cultural Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1990. 330 p. 15 × 22,5. \$13.95.

Nolland, John, *Luke 1-9:20* (Word Biblical Commentary 35A). Irving, Word Books, 1989. LXVI-454 p. 16 × 23,5.

Porter, Stanley E., *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (Studies in Biblical Greek). New York – Bern, Peter Lang, 1990. xii-582 p. 15,5 × 21,5. FrS 134.

Powell, Mark Allan, *What Are They Saying About Luke?* Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1990. viii-151 p. 13,5 × 20,5.

Serra, Aristide, *E c'era la Madre di Gesù...* (Gv.2,1). Saggi di esegesi biblico-mariana (1978-1988). Cernusco, Edizioni Cens-Marianum, 1989. v-667 p. 18 × 24,7. Lit. 50.000.

Sumney, Jerry L., *Identifying Paul's Opponents. The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians* (JSNT Supplement Series 40). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 256 p. 14 × 22. Cloth: £30.00–\$45.00; paper £22.50–\$33.50.

Weaver, Dorothy Jean, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse. A Literary Critical Analysis* (JSNT Supplement Series 38). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1990. 250 p. 14 × 22. £25.00–\$43.50.

Varia

Exégèse et obéissance. Correspondance Cormier-Lagrange (1904-1916) présentée, éditée et commentée par Bernard Montagnes, O.P. (Etudes Bibliques - Nouvelle série 11). Paris, J. Gabalda, 1989. 441 p. 16 × 24,5. FF 306.

Flavius Josephus, *Les Antiquités juives. Vol. I. Livres I à III.* Texte, traduction et notes par Etienne Nodet avec la collaboration de Gilles Berceville, André Paul, Elisabeth Warschawski. A – Introduction et texte; B – Traduction et notes. Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1990. xlv-155 p.; 190 p. 12,5 × 19,5. FF 185 les deux volumes.

Maggi, Alberto, *Notre-Dame des Hérétiques. Marie et Nazareth* (Collection Mariologie). Paris, Médiaspaul, 1990. 208 p. 14,5 × 21. FF 99.

Marchadour, Alain, *Grandi temi biblici.* Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1990. 80 p. 15,7 × 23. Lit. 10.000.

Meynet, Roland, *L'analyse rhétorique. Une nouvelle méthode pour comprendre la Bible* (Initiations). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1989. 347 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 220.

Pelletier, Marcel, *Les Pharisiens. Histoire d'un parti méconnu* (Lire la Bible 86). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1990. 372 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 110.

Penzo, Giorgio (ed.), *Schopenhauer e il sacro.* Atti del seminario tenuto a Trento il 26-28 aprile 1984 (Istituto di Scienze Religiose in Trento 12). Bologna, Centro Editoriale Dehoniano, 1987. 195 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 18.000.

Perelmuter, Hayim Goren, *Siblings. Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity at Their Beginnings.* Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1989. v-217 p. \$11.95.

Pérez Fernández, Miguel, *Midrás Sifre Números*. Versión crítica, introducción y notas (Biblioteca Midrásica 9). Valencia, Institución S. Jerónimo, 1989. 539 p. 16 × 24.

Perniola, Erasmo, *Sant'Efrem Siro*. Dottore della Chiesa e Cantore di Maria. Montefiascone (VT), Congregazione dei Figli dell'Immacolata Concezione, 1989. xv-386 p. 15,5 × 21,5. Lit. 32.000.

Quacquarelli, Antonio (ed.), *Complimenti interdisciplinari di Patrologia*. Roma, Città Nuova, 1989. 912 p. 15,5 × 24. Lit. 100.000.

Riché, Pierre – Châtillon, Jean – Verger, Jacques, *Lo studio della Bibbia nel Medioevo latino* (Studi Biblici 87) Brescia, Paideia, 1989. 152 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 18.000.

Sartori, Luigi (ed.), *Popoli messianici*. Atti del convegno tenuto a Trento il 16-17 maggio 1984 (Istituto di Scienze Religiose in Trento 11). Bologna, Centro Editoriale Dehoniano, 1987. 269 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 25.000

Schiffman, Lawrence, H., *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation (SBL Monograph Series 38). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. xi-101 p. 15 × 22,8. Cloth: \$22.95 (\$14.95); paper: \$14.95 (\$9.95).

Sekki, Arthur Everett, *The Meaning of RUAḤ at Qumran* (SBL Dissertation Series 110). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. x-261 p. 14 × 21,5. Cloth: \$17.95 (\$11.95); paper: \$11.95 (\$7.95).

Smith, Daniel L., *The Religion of the Landless*. The Social Context of the Babylonian Exile (Meyer Stone Books). New York, Crossroad Publishing Company, 1989. xvii-250 p. 15,5 × 23,5. Hardcover: \$39.95; paper: \$19.95.

Stadelmann, Rainer, *Die grossen Pyramiden von Giza*; Graz, Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt, 1990. 285 p. 15 × 20. ös 270,00.

Steindl, Helmut, *Genugtuung*. Biblisches Versöhnungsdenken – eine Quelle für Anselms Satisfaktionstheorie? (Studia Friburgensia Neue Folge 71). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag, 1989. xiv-338 p. 15,5 × 22,5. SFr 46,00.

Stemberger, Günter (Hrsg.), *Die Juden*. Ein historisches Lesebuch (BsR 410). München, Beck, 1990. 348 p. 11,8 × 18. DM 9,90.

Stroker, William D., *Extracanonial Sayings of Jesus* (SBL Resources for Biblical Study 18). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. viii-341 p. 15,5 × 23. Cloth: \$44.95 (\$29.95); paper: \$29.95 (\$19.95).

Talstra, E. (ed.), *Computer Assisted Analysis of Biblical Texts*. Papers read at the Workshop on the Occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of the "Werkgroep Informatica" Faculty of Theology, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, November, 5-6, 1987 (Applicatio 7). Amsterdam, Free University Press, 1989. 173 p. 16,3 × 24. fl. 75,00 – UK £36.00.

Thoma, Clemens – Wyschogrod, Michael (eds.), *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity* (A Stimulus Book). Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1989. vi-259 p. 14 × 21,5. \$9.95.

Townsend, John T., *Midrash Tanhuma*. Translated into English with Introduction, Indices, and Brief Notes (S. Buber Recension). Vol. I Genesis. Hoboken, Ktav Publishing House, 1989. xvii-334 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$39.50.

Von Soden, Wolfram, *Introduzione all'orientalistica antica* (Studi sul Vicino Oriente antico I). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 1989. 280 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 35.000.

Walton, John H., *Ancient Israelite Literature in Its Cultural Context. A Survey of Parallels Between Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Library of Biblical Interpretation). Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing House, 1990. 249 p. 16 × 24,5.

Zaharopoulos, Dimitri Z., *Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Bible. A Study of His Old Testament Exegesis*. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1989. 224 p. 13,5 × 20,3. \$11.95.

Zucal, Silvano (ed.), *La Weltanschauung cristiana di Romano Guardini* (Istituto di Scienza Religiosa in Trento 13). Bologna, Centro Editoriale Dehoniano, 1988, 495 p. 14 × 21,5. Lit. 35.000.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA